

The
American Historical Review

AMERICAN HISTORY AND AMERICAN DEMOCRACY¹

IN every field of modern scientific study there is a body of workers with a certain sense of companionship and a feeling of identity of interests and enthusiasm. Intellectual isolation is almost unknown. New discoveries and contributions to knowledge do not come unheralded from some unknown corner of the thinking world; almost everything—if we know the real scientific processes behind it—we find to be the product of general intellectual movement, in which there has been division of labor, in which there have been leaders and specialists, but also co-operation and intelligent sympathy. History is less thoroughly organized as a field of research than any one of the natural sciences and less than at least one of the social sciences; but the sense of fellowship, the common understanding of aims and ideals, the feeling that we are working together and that ideas are common property, the historical investigators possess in marked degree. No one of us can be very far along in his study of any period without finding that others are beside him or perhaps in accomplishment a parasang in advance. Symmetry and good sense in historical product, showing appreciation of the course followed and the stages reached, are wrought out, not alone by the use of bibliographies and by the application of critique, but by the effect of companionship and the generous interchange of personal opinion.

For this end, this sense of community, the American Historical Association has been consciously and unconsciously working for thirty years. We have the right to congratulate ourselves on results: the spirit of helpfulness and generous appreciation, the knowledge of our individual tastes, capacities, and failings, the fact that book and monograph, as they appear, are the result of combined as well as varied historical study and devotion.

¹ Annual address of the president of the American Historical Association, delivered at Chicago, December 29, 1914.

Some such thoughts as these must come to one called upon for a brief period to preside over this body; and I find myself almost unable to go forward and address my audience without this foreword of appreciation, without for a moment calling the Association to self-consciousness. Probably I am also influenced by the feeling of timidity, which, I imagine, would come to almost any of us endeavoring to speak with some show of assurance to a body of historical scholars, of whose learning and depth of interest he is fully aware. For one must realize, because of the homogeneity I have spoken of, and this interplay of ideas, how difficult it is to be novel, fresh, and illuminating. One can, however, cherish the consolation that if he keeps well within the bounds of the safe and well known, he will at least show he is not far from the life and thought of others.

I propose to discuss the subject of American democracy as a point of view in the writing of American history, and to present my own reactions as to what is central and most fundamental in any wide survey of the last three centuries as we look back upon them. To-day, perhaps more than at any time during our lifetime, we are looking hopefully and fearfully at the whole democratic régime—on the one hand encouraged by a profound belief that a nation, acknowledging the principle that the masses of men should have free opportunity to work out their own destiny, must in the end satisfy the actual needs of men and not the ambitions of privilege; on the other doubting whether mass government, with its heedlessness, wastefulness, incoherence, and absence of foresight, can actually maintain itself, and not only continue to live here in America amid the perplexities and the formidable economic and social trials that beset us, but go on and manifest itself as a conquering world-force. We question with a new foreboding whether in the awful, soul-destroying competition for racial and national aggrandizement, the state which is not led by the trained mind, the scientific expert, the calculating statesman with assured authority, can hold its own and give free scope to the great essential economic and spiritual longings, the blind desires of the multitude, which we have supposed, by the philosophy of democracy, to be the safest and surest impulse for the establishment of human good. We feel called on, as never before, to take stock calmly and going back over our history to estimate the accomplishments and the failings of the American unmethodic system of progress.

But in any such study, not much can be done without recognizing that history has to do with things of the spirit, for fundamentally democracy is a spirit and not merely a form of government. The

historical investigator is ever seeking for facts and events, too well content possibly if he succeeds in finding them and in making some sort of connection with what went before and after. This must on the whole be his daily task; for if we would come to see long lines of tendency and continuing causes and if we wish to watch the interlacing of influences, which appear to flow from varying and different sources, we cannot know the course of the lines without fixing the points, and influences to be known need to be studied in detail and viewed first of all in comparative isolation. But of course history deals with more than events, and with more than the mere outward actions of men; it has to do with ideals and purposes, with the spirit and character of man. And I have sometimes thought in recent days that history was too much afraid of itself, too fearful of anything reaching out into the philosophy of the unseen, as if the unseen were not real. Has history nothing to do with things of the spirit, and has it become materialistic and materializing? Has it no eye for the substance of things hoped for and the evidence of things unseen? Has it in and of itself no mission beyond cataloguing? Has it become in itself or will it become an unspirited or dispirited industry? Is not the scientist who writes of the mechanistic conception of life more nearly a ministering spirit than the maker of catalogues of events, more nearly humanistic than the historian who dreads even psychology and fails to reckon with *mores* and folk-ways, lest he venture and be lost in the unpathed wilderness of sociology? The scientist has no fear: the chemist dealing deftly with atoms, the physicist handling unseen force and giving it name and quality, the astronomer looking into infinite space and speaking in terms beyond the finite—they have no fear of philosophy or metaphysics or of all-embracing reality; they would see things face to face. They will not call their faith religious, but they are consciously reaching after the causative, the unifying, the universal, and the eternal. But history is afraid, industrial, materialistic, satisfied with product, keeping accounts, priding itself on its full storehouses.

American history has more to do than to hunt facts or catalogue occurrences. Above all other histories it has the task of feeling character and divining living spirit. For America has been conscious of a purpose and a place and a particular destiny. It may well have had a meaning of which it did not know; but beyond other nations or bodies of men it had, and it thinks it has, a mission. Whatever America may really mean, it has believed that its feet were rightly set on a path leading to human improvement, and, though the mean-

ing of our own life is far beyond our own consciousness, our history must be studied fundamentally with this fact in mind. Even to-day the man on the street has no trouble in finding phrases to express his belief in what we are and should be, and it has always been so; indeed, the newest comer to our shores often seems to know better than does the scholar or the man of big affairs what we are and whither we should go. Below the discontent and the bitterness of social strife is some sense that we are failing to live up to the ideals we still sometimes put into words. And thus in all we write or think of the past, we cannot wisely omit the hopes and enthusiasms which have been animating the nation; we cannot close our eyes to the fact that there have come changes, moods, developments of temperament, and that these manifestations of intangible character and spirit are the things best deserving evaluation. We may well question whether a nation can ever become truly great without intense self-consciousness and self-appreciation, and, however closely the historian may cling to ideals of scientific objectivity, he may well believe that one duty of historical study and writing is to help make a nation conscious of its most real self, by bringing before it its own activity and the evidences of its own psychology.

In the interpretation of American history, and especially I think constitutional history, writers have plainly been influenced by their own environments. And so any historical work you or I may do is likely to be colored, whether or not we intentionally select a particular prism through which to view the past. Bancroft's great epic, with its paeon of exultation over escape from bondage, was a very natural expression of the buoyant, self-confident democracy of the Jacksonian era. The great thought which dominated the time was that, from the heroic deeds of the Fathers, came independence from the mother-country, independence and liberty. If to-day Bancroft's attitude toward his subject seems provincial, despite his heroic attempt to review in passing the events of European history, if it seems rhetorical and over subjective, his work will be of lasting import because he was permeated by the atmosphere of his generation and because he grasped or sought to grasp the spirit of America. After Bancroft's earlier volumes were written, there came a period in which the interesting questions were those of union and slavery. While sectionalism prospered or seemed to prosper, there was a fixed determination to maintain union; nationalist and sectionalist alike viewed the Constitution as a solemn arrangement, a fundamental engagement and provision for union—I do not mean *the* Union or unity,

but something more than isolation. To one set of readers, debaters, and writers the union meant creation of a certain national authority; to the others it meant conservation and preservation of local interest; all agreed that its purpose was to harmonize, protect, and make compatible different interests and varying sectional qualities. The great hope of the time was to prevent disintegration. Calhoun, who can hardly be banished from the field of history any more than from the domain of practical politics or metaphysics, came in his desire for union to see the Constitution as an arrangement for protecting local autonomy, almost as a contract between sections.

Through these years before the Civil War and for some time thereafter slavery came forth as the great matter of discussion, and men read constitutional treatises and examined events of the past to see what light they threw on slavery. Only very recently have we broken away from the tendency to see in the debates at Philadelphia a struggle over slavery; the temptation was strong, almost irresistible, to find North and South pitted against each other, and so arrayed because one was free, the other slave. We needed to tell ourselves and others that the line did not run between North and South, but between little states and big, and that there were lines connecting men of similar social and economic interest. Looking at the days after the Constitution was adopted, we were sure to find what we looked for and more than the fact, not economic and social cleavage and interest or other reasons for division into parties or cliques, but sectionalism with slavery lurking in the background only to be seen by the unerring eye of the man who knew that slavery caused the Civil War, and knew that the Civil War was the only determining, all-meaning event in American annals because it freed the black.

Just as at earlier days we read the history of the colonies with our eyes steadily fixed on Bunker Hill and Yorktown, so for some time after the Civil War men read and wrote remembering that there had been a war fixing the political character of the Union. Von Holst's great treatise was written with a steady eye on Secession. Himself a child of 1848, an enthusiast for union and for liberty—the well-ordered, obedient kind of liberty which a German knows how to admire—he never understood Jefferson or Jackson, while Louisiana, Florida, the Bank, and the War with Mexico, were for him chiefly episodes in constitutional construction and slavery, leading up to South Carolina, Jefferson Davis, and Lincoln.

If we select Von Holst for special mention because his work was able and his volumes many, we need also to remember that most of us have done the same and that only in very recent days have we

come to see that the war was not the end but was itself an episode in a long train of events and causation. I mean to present no objection to anyone's seeking to discover the causes of anything susceptible of being explained by the past; the long succession of incidents and changing conditions lying in the years before the Civil War or of any other war, as far as they explain that event, are properly chosen and held up to view; but I am pointing out that we select and interpret with something central and determinate in our minds, and that American history has been written and read, in considerable degree at least, because men wished to explain some things which were of immediate and fresh interest to them and which *now* do not appear final and all-important.

Many of us are even now looking out upon the field of constitutional history as a branch and only a branch of economic history. One can find no fault with the desire to trace the development of economic conditions, or with the wish to see how economic forces have played through political institutions or toyed with constitutions and parties. The story is there for some one to tell, convincingly if he can and truthfully if he is able to see the light. The ever present danger is the old one—the temptation to find in the past the present, not simply conditions out of which the present came, and to find just what we expect to find and not the almost infinite variety of motive and interest and of personal and social character which changed and changed again under new environment and responded to new suggestion. We are in imminent hourly danger of finding in our midst, and working as one of our own pawns, the economic man, that well-known servant of another science, whom we have all been taught to treat with distant and decent respect as the property of a neighbor whose work we admire but would not imitate.

Probably I am myself the creature of a day, illustrating present moods and visions alone, when I suggest that, primarily, constitutional construction, union, slavery, war, conflicting emotions for states' rights or centralized authority, class interest, economic movement, all bear primarily on the problem which America still faces and on the ideal which, consciously held or not through the whole course of our history, will be looked upon as determining America's place in the world. Certainly we have not yet passed out of the position where we are considered and where we consider ourselves as testing an experiment in popular government and in the development of democratic possibilities. In these days, it is true, our institutions are subjected to the pitiless fire of criticism and are no longer held up to the world as in themselves idols demanding incense and worship;

but probably even the unthinking man never seriously held that the institutions were the sole things intrinsically all-important. We fell, however, into that manner of speech and still use it; for but yesterday I read in a thoughtful magazine article the statement and the prophecy that if the church did not survive and give nourishment to our spiritual life, our institutions would surely fall. What indeed would it profit a man if he gain his own soul and lose his institutions? And yet, behind all this manner of speech there has been from the beginning a conviction that forms of government only symbolized and illustrated something deeper and more worth while.

Is it to distort history again to imagine that the historian of the distant future is bound to inquire whether the experiment in self-government, with all the attendant ideals and motives, really worked out to make men bigger, better, stronger, and higher; to inquire what the struggle was, what the difficulties, what the progress and the retrogression, what war, expansion, factories and machinery, constitutions and courts, food and physical environment, the city and the frontier, all working together, meant and how they operated in the development of men; to inquire whether the ideals, peculiarly represented in governmental institutions, were really masterful and worked out into actual improvement? If this be distortion I must make the best of it; for whether the historians of the future have the problem or not, we certainly are to-day interested in what has gone before us, primarily, I believe, with this experiment in self-government in mind, with all that it involves, or with all that we find to be wrapt up in it—social and individual justice, right as God gives us to see the right, and human condition. Secondary to all this must be placed political and sectional conflict and the din of industrial strife. Amid all this tumult, all the play and impact of human energy, did the ideals of self-government hold firm? How were they altered, through what phases did they pass, how did transient moods or changing problems modify them and affect their onward course? If we have such questions in mind, the stress and emphasis on events of the past will be differently laid in any wide and general view of American history. We remember the words of Henry Adams describing America—spiritual America—at the beginning of the last century:

European travellers who passed through America noticed that everywhere, in the White House at Washington and in log-cabins beyond the Alleghanies, except for a few Federalists, every American, from Jefferson and Gallatin down to the poorest squatter, seemed to nourish an idea that he was doing what he could to overthrow the tyranny which the past had fastened on the human mind.²

² *History*, I. 175.

Naturally the events of history must be established by research, and often, if not always, established without any reference to present conditions; a period must be studied in order that all the forces working through or in it may be appreciated and that the characteristics of the succeeding period may be known. I make no plea for the rejection of everything that has no conceivable bearing on the development or workings of American self-government. Everything that made America what it is deserves consideration. Before the eyes of all of us, however, rises the figure of the woodsman of a century ago. As he stood looking out upon the still unconquered continent, seeing visions of human progress, determined to break down the tyranny inherited from the past, believing in a wide and noble freedom, he appears to us the very genius of American history; we can never ignore him for there in very truth he stood and thus in very fact he thought. How far have his dreams come true? With face turned toward the future and with mind filled with characteristic American optimism and confidence, he little knew the difficulty of winning bodily liberty and soul freedom for man, little realized that new tyrannies would take the place of older ones and that chains of his own forging would clog his every step.

A hurried review of certain periods and movements in our history will serve to illustrate my meaning. The new interpretation and the new choice of incidents and points of attention in colonial history emphasize the importance of the colonies as portions of the English empire. The study is part of the effort to understand the expansion of England, or it is part of the general world-history of imperial order and organization. Few problems of the present day are of more absorbing interest than just this problem of imperial expansion and control, for it is perplexing the souls of men everywhere; it is perplexing our souls as we think of the Philippines, Cuba, and the dark cloud on our southern boundary. Moreover, even this study of imperial order and practice is of moment for the student of American constitutional history, for out of the practical working system of the English empire came the system of political organization which we call the American federal state; the composite English empire, with practical distribution of powers between governments, was the parent of the composite United States, the first great federalized empire based upon law and not on opportunism. All this is of great importance; and yet the older point of view, if in some respects provincial and inadequate, is vitally sound at heart; for, though colonial history was often written in earlier days as if the colonies were not colonies, it was written with the idea that histor-

ical tradition, habits of mind, and social and political institutions were forming to come down into the later United States. Most of the older history was written as if the end in view was independence and revolution, or union without even reference to the character of the union; but there was some recognition of the fact that what was done in colonial times had a longer and wider meaning than this. However, over-refinement and over-sensitiveness about viewpoints are needless; colonial history will continue to be viewed as the background of our own history, and, as we more and more come to see it aright, we can better understand the origin of the new self-conscious experiment in democracy, to which was attributed the virtues and vices of democratic government, and from which have been continually drawn evidences to demonstrate the folly of trying to be at once honest, orderly, and democratic. We must remember that, if we have in our later days judged ourselves by other standards and lost sense of what we are and mean, Europe has not ceased for one moment in the last hundred and fifty years to watch us—in war, diplomacy, industrial growth, education, and religion—as a democracy.

Anyone resenting and rejecting the avenue of approach which I have suggested, can hardly help being converted temporarily by considering the Revolutionary period which began about the outbreak of the old French war and ended with the Constitution of the United States. This was a time in which institutions, principles, and character were forming. The important thing for us is what men did and above all what they thought, because out of their doing and thinking came much of the America we know. And yet the Revolution is still spoken of as if it were the war; the days from the peace of 1763 to the surrender at Yorktown are still commonly spoken of as if the great and only thing was independence; whereas in reality both the war and independence were incidents and opportunities in the development of American ideals and ideas, in the unfolding of institutions which formulated or partly expressed principles. The problem which confronted England in the middle of the eighteenth century was whether she could maintain and establish on a permanent basis a far-reaching empire; practically, whether she could reconcile general integrity of the empire with local freedom, and whether, holding the whole as a real political thing, she could grant the opportunity for the developing vigor of younger England across the sea. She failed, because, using all the power of legalistic argument gathered from the stores of purely insular experience, she insisted upon the theoretical acknowledgment of

centralization. The whole controversy enabled America to work out through failure and success the principle of federalism, the establishment of the federal state. All this period is of immense interest, then, because there came out of it a type of imperial organization—one of the two or three signal contributions of America and England to the world of statesmen and state-makers. But even federalism was most significant because, through that mode of political organization, it was possible to hold together a great people, prepared, not in little communities, but in continent-wide proportions, to try the experiment of self-government on a scale hitherto unknown in the world. The arguments for American rights during the Revolutionary period are therefore not important solely or chiefly because they supported rebellion or irritated the complacent ministers in London to acts which precipitated war. Their importance lies in the fact that they foreshadowed federal order and the basis of the composite democratic state.

Even more than federal order and imperial organization came out of the contest with Britain, though we still have the events recounted to us as if even argument and political theory were of interest solely because they were used in bringing on the war; as if the thing to be accounted for is the cleavage of the English race, and not the making of America; as if the war was an incident in British imperial history, not an incident and a cause in the development of American life. Thus the philosophy of the Revolution, the world of ideas in which men lived and moved, are by this treatment made subordinate to battle, though battle was but the opportunity to make over ideas into working realities. Men, in fact, used the philosophy of Locke, Vattel, and the soldiers who had gathered around the camp-fires of Cromwell's Ironsides; they used the teachings of Milton and the Puritanic theories of divine command and unchanging right, not that they might fight; they fought that they might use their philosophy, and out of their fighting and thinking came principles and institutions. This is true, even if we confine our attention to the conscious purposes of men; it is all the more true when we remember that the thing of consequence to us is the emergence of constitutions and ideals out of the wreckage of tea boxes and above the noise of strife. If I were called upon to select a single fact or enterprise which more nearly than any other single thing embraced the significance of the American Revolution, I should select—not Saratoga or the French Alliance or even the Declaration of Independence—I should choose the formation of the Massachusetts constitution of 1780, and I should do so because that consti-

tution rested on the fully developed convention, the greatest institution of government which America has produced, the institution which answered, in itself, the problem of how men could make governments of their own free will, the problem which had troubled and perplexed philosophers and reformers from the time when men began to inquire whether man existed for government or government for man. Moreover, below and beyond the convention were active principles of individual right and justice which were fundamentally inherent in the social and life order of the day. We can more nearly understanding the woodsman, that genius of America, if we see how John Adams and Theophilus Parsons struggled with the task of fastening ideas in institutions. To suppose that these ideas are of the dead past, to treat of the idealistic foundations of authority as fit only for scientific study or for a cabinet of historical curios, is to lose the force of the permanent in American history, and to be blind to facts which are at this moment of towering significance amid the travail of the nations.

Anyone studying the Revolution patiently with eyes open for American achievement, with eyes open to what the contest really meant in our history, will be likely to think that the chiefest movement was not casting aside the chastening hand of the mother-country or the cutting of her apron strings. It was the movement that went on within the colony, simultaneously with the conflict of words and arms against Britain, and resulted in a change in the colony itself. For here again the war was an experience affecting character, as experiences are sure to affect character. It was an opportunity for the play of social forces which deeply modified the nature of the state and its people. We know much about the Revolution as a contest with Britain; we do not yet know enough of the Revolution within America. Primarily, then, navigation acts and port bills, battles and alliances, are intrinsically subordinate to the modification and enlargement of American life. Of this, as I have said, we know little enough. What we want to know more about is not the revolution of America but the experiences by which every colony was in part transformed because of the new opportunity for self-expression and for working out the forces within itself.

If we pass on to the early experiences in the decade or two after the adoption of the Constitution we find their meaning—and I venture to say their higher meaning—as experiences bearing upon the history of democratic government. Even the sore perplexity arising from diplomacy and trouble with Indians has its bearing on popular government, because all these trials reacted on authority

and tested the capacity for judgment and self-control; the mere fact that America lived through the first decades and surmounted her troubles is the important thing. But if one, admitting this fact, should put it aside as too obvious for comment, he will not fail to acknowledge that during the first decades, ideas of government and of popular participation in government were taking on new forms or finding institutional expression. He may not fail to admit it, and yet our history has not by any means been written with this fact uppermost in the writer's mind. We have for example often been told that political parties have always been distinguished by differing modes or principles of constitutional construction. Such assertions were made because the writer was dominated by the notion that the great primary question was not democracy, or even property, but union and national organization. I have no doubt that men were in part actuated consciously by certain beliefs and prejudices concerning nationalism and states' rights; but behind all this was something more. Even states' rights rested on more than local pride and prejudice. Constitutional doctrine was only a support or a weapon. Were it not for some of the books I read, I should suppose it quite unnecessary to assert a fact, which appears elementary, that class interests were involved in these early conflicts and that behind them all was the question whether men could and should govern themselves. Even the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions were more than a protest against overweening nationalism or Federalistic interpretation affecting the rights of the states as such, and it gives us new hold on the whole doctrine of the Resolutions, to read them not from the viewpoint of the Nullification of 1832 or the Secession of 1861, but as embodying in a new way the principles upon which the Revolution—not the Civil War—was fought. Jefferson was not first of all, through and through, a states'-rights man, a strict constructionist, a sympathizer with France, an ambitious leader of men; he was a frontiersman or half-frontiersman under whose blows had already fallen in his native state, primogeniture, entail, and the established church, and who in the nineteenth century formed a university to help in breaking the shackles that held the human mind. It appears not altogether needless even now, after the appearance of many histories and sundry biographies, to declare that Jeffersonism treated not as a spirit, but as a mode of constitutional interpretation or as a system of administration, is not Jeffersonism at all.

What shall we say of party organization, the formation of formidable vital institutions? We can and must say that here we have

a formulation of tremendous influence and significance. Only very recently has the party been seen in its true light as an instrument of government, begotten by the necessities and the opportunities in the popular or quasi-popular state. We see it now. We see that the vital thing was not the government but the association of men gathered into bodies with governments of their own, with determination to get possession of the machinery of administration and legislation. We see that what we call the government was a fortress to be seized by a successful army, and that the army embodied the force and the energy; the army was the thing of real life. But it is a striking illustration of our blindness, that, until something over a decade ago, almost nothing had been done to study the party as a governmental institution, and one intimately connected with the psychology of democracy.

Again, what shall we say of parties? Were they means of expressing popular desire or of molding and controlling it? What effect did party have on the developing character of the popular state? Plainly the problem and the tasks of democracy become more complex because of the multiplication of governments and the increasing rigidity of institutions, which were supposed, often falsely, to be responsive to demands of the people. The complicated nature of the whole situation is humorously presented by the formation of the Jeffersonian party: It was a national party formed to protect states' rights, as if the very spirit of nationalism permeating a party was not at war with localism; it was a highly complicated institution bent upon protecting and furthering individualism, as if individualism and institutionalism were not always in conflict and at daggers drawn; it was a democratic party furnished with organization by a leader and subjected to the command of a dynasty, anxious to control government and to advance its own interests, even when sincerely devoted to sentiment and the "cherishment of the people". The whole history of party machinery and of partizanship is a history of one striking aspect of democratic government; caucuses and platforms, conventions and direct primaries, leaders and bosses, all have their meaning in connection with the struggles for the realization of an ideal of self-government, and with the ideal, not always so consciously present, of a simple and just social order. We have commonly studied parties as if the main thing was the doctrine which they professed; we now see that we must study them with the knowledge that principles were often only *impedimenta*, and we wish to know how, in their constitutions, movements, tendencies, or essential character, they advanced or hindered the activities and quali-

ties of a people who would be and who thought they were self-governing and were winning and using opportunity for self-realization. A party therefore, as seen to-day, is an institution which was developed in the modern popular state for carrying opinions into government and putting men into office, and which, in the course of the decades, creating a character and a government of its own, operated in part at least to benumb individual thought, to control as well as gather public opinion and to hamper efforts for self-government. The individual and the mass in an effort to manage public affairs seem to get inextricably entangled in their own machinery and to be always making their own inhibitions by their very efforts to act. To understand the party we need once again to know the American psychology and to appreciate the spirit of an earnest, hurried, bewildered, confident, changing people.

The decades between the Revolution of 1800 and the surrender at Appomattox are of course full of complexity and I have neither the inclination nor the ability to translate the life of the time into definite terms of human effort bearing on the problem of the popular state, the state which started out believing it had a mission and which still thinks it stands for an idea and a principle. But here again things have a new and more real interest for me if I read them in the light of democracy—a changing and developing democracy, it is true, but a democracy believing more than ever before in itself and its destiny—or if I read them with much more in mind than slavery and civil war. The most important fact characteristically omitted or obscured by all but very recent historians was the development of the spirit of democracy, which radically modified our more formal institutions of government; this change in the spirit was of course the change of deepest import.

During a large portion of this so-called middle period of our history, there were various sorts of sectionalism affecting the activity and the character of the nation. We have been well and wisely taught that, especially in the fifty years preceding Lincoln's inauguration, the conflict of forces was by no means altogether between North and South; that all through our history East and West were realities; that American democracy was molded by the frontier and our character shaped by the opportunities of a continent. The rapid peopling of the Mississippi Valley and the general effect of westward expansion have been seen at something like their true value in the last twenty years, for it was only twenty-one years ago that the article on the "Significance of the Frontier" was read to this Association. It is just such grasping of facts in a way to disclose their spiritual

import that appears most desirable in any wide consideration of changing American civilization. We have come to see the general significance of East and West, two regions in the same body politic, one further advanced than the other in social complexity and industrial organization; we have come to see that this sectionalism had its effect on the essential character of America and marked the routes along which democracy moved. So perhaps the sectionalism which distinguished North from South, because they were in different stages or conditions of industrial and social order, may yet be studied as more than explanatory of war and of varying constitutional construction. Moreover we had, in fact, for fifty years, four or five sections—partly self-conscious; and until we know their economic and psychic reactions we cannot know American history.

Until very recent days, slavery and slave-owning were treated without special regard for the significance of the whole problem for us. Until long after the war, the North insisted on discussing slavery almost as an abstraction; the central and dominant thought was that slavery was inhuman and wrong. Well, so it was. I have no desire to underestimate the meaning of the institution or to belittle the contest between slavery and the great wave of humanitarianism which finally washed the curse away and made the black a freeman. One cannot stand unaffected as he traces the growth of a movement which ended in the final overthrow of a system and of ideas which were hoary with age when Moses stood beside the burning bush and heard the call of the Lord summoning him to lift His chosen people from bondage. And yet I think I am right in saying that we are now come to the point where we look upon the disappearance of American slavery as an incident in the general history of relationship between races, as part of the history of the problem which more than any other is troubling and arousing men the world over—seemingly the greatest single problem we know to-day if we look out over the world and include in our view Australia, South Africa, the Balkans, Russia, the United States, and India. But, though all this be true, though slavery as we see it in American history has its place in this wider field of world conditions, we are forced to see it here as it affected the growth and helped to form the character of the popular state. We may study, if we will, how American conditions affected race relationships; but as students of American history we are chiefly intent upon knowing how race relationships affected America. And as we study the whole matter, we see that slave-owning had a meaning not less important than slavery; certainly not less significant than the subjection of the blacks was the nature, purpose, and quality, inherent

in the developing character of the industry and its management; for slave-owning was a form of capitalism, and in its later phases a form of "big business", the first form or one of the first forms which, with determination, reached out to make policies and to control governments for its own advancement; it was an economic interest seeking to subordinate political authority and national ideals to its own ends.

The Civil War, though caused by slavery, involved more than union or disunion, free labor or slave; it meant more than a clash between theories of constitutional construction. During the days of actual conflict it had a deeper meaning to far-seeing men here and to men across the water ready to look upon all we did or thought as incidents in the life of a state which had held up to the world the idea of free government. The aristocrat in England instinctively sympathized with the South, not because he favored the crude primitive form of slavery in which the master owned the body of the toiler, nor because he disbelieved in the maxims or emotions of humanitarianism, nor yet because he cherished the "sacred right of revolution". The life and fortunes of a mighty democratic state were in the balance; discord and dismay, appearing to foretell the breakdown of the great republic, fortified and justified aristocratic distrust of popular government. Lincoln too was not misled; thus too he saw the conflict: "Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived or so dedicated can long endure." He had in mind of course the ideals of the nation, not the relationship between races; for no one knew better than he did that, four score and seven years before, men had not been dedicated to the extirpation of negro slavery. Such thoughts as these I hesitate to give utterance to, if they seem to reflect upon the sentiment of a section which was buoyed up by a certain nobility of motive and by a loftiness of purpose, and which still cherishes, and rightly cherishes, the memories of a struggle in which men died for what they believed right. The thing farthest from my mind is to throw obloquy on a section by any imputation of low motives. We have, I hope, passed by all that. The historian can hardly pass over the war, however, as if it meant nothing but the victory of a nationalistic interpretation of the Constitution or the freeing of the black men. Lincoln and aristocratic England could not have been wholly wrong when they considered the war a crisis in the experiment of democratic self-government.

Whether you agree with me in what I have just said or do not agree, you will, I think, be ready to look upon the Civil War as only one of the wars of aggregation and integration in the nineteenth century. The historian, writing of the world movements of the nineteenth century, must include our war as one of the wars making for national integrity and solidarity. Our great struggle meant the establishment of a united single and simplified nation, through which and in which the forces of modern industry and social order found new opportunity for development and strife. The very simplification, amplification, and unification resulting from the conflict, established conditions for later activity in every field of effort or of unconscious movement. Irrespective of motives, causes, and antecedent conditions, the war was itself causative. The war of aggregation rested on united effort and involved development, not only of governmental power, but of social and psychological concentration. The nation came out of it, despite loss and some demoralization, prepared for big unified undertakings. The foundation and progress of nation-wide commercial enterprises were, in part, the product of this vast effort to realize unity and to put forth force in the preservation of union. If men are what they do, if every man is the creature of his own works, then the northern army and the multitude behind it, with minds combined and centred on one common object, were day by day creating capacity for big things in the field of industry—big things which for a time at least overshadowed government, changed conditions of society and appeared to be ushering in a new feudalism which belied and belittled any ideals of equality, individualism, or democracy. It is a mere, well-recognized, truism to say that in Europe the struggle for national statehood created the social basis for a new intellectual and social order, and that, on the other hand, the changing order helped to bring on the struggle. Who would dare, for example, to speak of modern Germany with any show of intelligence, if he had no sense of the psychological effect of achieved nationalism? But in America we have not yet come to a full realization of the tremendous effect of a conflict for integral existence.

But even if the war had no such effect on the social psychology of the nation, this, beyond peradventure, is true: the twenty years after the war were taken up with discussion and argument about it, and men were but dimly conscious that the times loudly called for attention to much besides the things that had embittered their souls. Those twenty years, eventful almost beyond measure, full of movements which were of stupendous import in the life of America, were

studied but yesterday as if they were merely years that came after the war, years of political reconstruction, and not years of overmastering construction, the beginnings of modern industrial America, the America which is trying and testing anew the ambitions and principles of popular government and of social appreciation. We must in fact go back into the war for the beginning of the period, and there we find the act granting land for the western railroads looming up out of the mass of events which covered and obscured it; and in this we see something only less significant—if less dramatic and conclusive—than Vicksburg or Gettysburg. To us to-day, therefore, the war seems almost as important for the reason that men groped about in the mist and dust for a generation afterward, unmindful of what was going on about them and losing the spiritual significance of their own acts, as for the reason that the war had wrought the disappearance of slavery and the establishment of union. We have now begun to talk of industrial development, of the rise of gigantic industry, of factories and railroads and money, of the rise of all those problems which began with the Industrial Revolution but did not seriously begin with us till after the Civil War and which we have known fully and seen face to face for only a decade or two.

No man, I suppose, is thoroughly acquainted with what he is; his memory helps him to know himself. A nation is fortunate if it has even memory—which is history; yet society appears to recognize itself in a condition of existence only when it has already passed, or is just passing into a new stage. We need not speak, therefore, even of the present, with any assurance of knowledge; for, though we think we know what we are and whence we came, we are presumably opening for the future unexpected avenues of progress and throwing up obstacles now unseen. Certain it is that in the decades after the Civil War, we thought we were a nation which had overcome discord, had set up national unity, and was living in unified and secured power. In reality we were a people falling or fallen under the spell of a changing social order, destroying the frontier and the wilderness which had made us what we were and which we hardly knew till they were gone, entering upon phases of industrialism fraught with new perils, fastening chains upon ourselves by the corporate organization of parties, becoming victims of our own prosperity and increasing wealth, admitting in increasing number to our borders and trying to assimilate myriads of humans, whose race capacities and traditions were bound to complicate the problems of social and political movement and to modify the psychology of a nation hitherto comparatively uniform in ethnic composition.

The Fourteenth Amendment is looked on as a product of the war; it is classed by us as a part of so-called Reconstruction; in truth it is a document of immense importance in the history of the years which were filled with problems of industrial and social order unaffected by the old problems of suffrage and sectional difference. With a striking contradiction, it called in national unified power to protect individual right under government; based on individualistic thought, it was and is significant because, on and around it, gathered a mass of technical judicial decisions and a great horde of principles concerning police power, to all intents and purposes a new branch of public law. The lawyer has long ago forgotten that the amendment had anything to do with rebuilding a union of states, with war and disunion, or with blacks and ballots. To him it is an opportunity to test the validity of state legislation affecting corporate interests based on the principles of individualistic law. Nothing better than this illustrates how full of pitfalls and hazards is the course of democracy and how supremely difficult is the task of self-government. Just at the moment when society was moving away most markedly from conditions of individualism and entering upon a fuller recognition of itself, just when forces were assiduously at work creating new social claims and duties, just when there was coming to life a series of social forces which appeared to be individualizing society and socializing the individual, an amendment, founded on thinking which was already in part outgrown, was added to the organic law and was soon appealed to, not so much to protect the individual, as to shield the corporation which is an individual only in the eyes of the law.

We have, as I have already said, learned in considerable measure the spiritual significance of the frontier and the meaning of nature in the growth of America. Now that the frontier is gone, we see that, while the task of conquering the continent developed American character and quickened capacity, it did something more than establish individual self-reliance. If at one time nature, the wide prairies and the free forest, seemed to offer permanent assurance of individual right and the reality of individual freedom, they in fact furnished too the foundations for great fortunes and for gigantic undertakings eclipsing in their magnificence anything the world had ever known before. Thus again appear perplexing contradictions, conflicts between activities and actual results—nature stimulating individualism and creating masterful organization. If free government and democracy be shipwrecked in the conflict between classes, the historian of the future, looking back on American history, will see

the New World with one hand holding out opportunity and prompting men to independent thought and action, with the other lavishly offering room for colossal undertakings to be carried out only by combination and system; he will see the individual man using the resources of a virgin continent and storing up vast wealth, which constantly recreated and enlarged itself, until he was caught and held captive by the results of his own toil and submerged by his own product, and until inequality of industrial opportunity involved loss of political and social equality as well. He will also see, I fear, the decades of waste and destruction, affecting, deeply affecting the national spirit and capacity and interfering with what beyond peradventure must show itself if democracy survive—I mean economic efficiency in all forms of political activity. If democracy cannot husband resources, save life, accomplish much with little, give justice without prodigal expenditure of energy, unrelenting nature is fighting against ultimate realization of success. Beneath all the superstructure of even spiritual achievement for the masses of men rests economy—economy of physical and intellectual effort to secure justice and freedom for the spirit. Much that we do to-day at enormous expenditure of thought and social sympathy would not need to be done at all, if democracy were saving and *self-respecting*, looking out for its own needs, thoughtful, foreseeing, *self-governing*.

In speaking of American democracy I have thus far made no attempt to analyze the ideal or the fact into its elements, though in reality it is a composite. Behind all the variety and conflict, however, has rested the belief that men should have a chance and not be sifted or sorted on any artificial or traditional theory of worth; mass government has been thought desirable because it has been thought to make secure a sound and thoroughly natural basis of evaluation. Because we still harbor this sentimental belief, we look with foreboding on stratification and classification, which will either benumb personal effort or, by setting up group barriers, prevent free play of common sentiments and motives; for the groundwork of democratic equality is the common possession of human ideals.

We still talk in terms of old-time politics, and the terms may well be used if they carry with them recognition of new realities; and so I may use the term "new nationalism"; but I do not mean any theory of relationship between governments or any doctrine of unchecked constitutional construction—those things even now are of the past; for in reality what is a nation? No definition borrowed from ethnology or political science serves to answer the question, for nationality rests on more than blood or physiognomy or shapes of skulls;

there is no cephalic index of the spirit. A nation implies more than subjection to a government or than inclusion within geographical limits; it means, as Mazzini declared, a body of people united in a common duty toward the world; it involves, if it be real, the possession, the all-absorbing and the common possession, of ideals and beliefs. If the free state is, as Thiers once said, a moral being which thinks before it acts, the fully self-conscious nation is one permeated by certain hopes and purposes upon which it lives and to which it devotes its life. You cannot have a nation without a common property in things of the mind and the soul.

The new or the renewed nationalism, therefore, does not consist in breaking down state authority or overcoming geographic provincialism; it must have for its purpose the bigger American task of unifying society on principles of common idealism. We need to leave behind us the older terms, if freighted with their older meanings. Just as we had industrial nationality before we were aware of it and while we still spoke in legal phrases or in the words of political science, with our eyes fixed on a political system, on the relationship between geographic sections, and on classified governments, so we may have a denationalized society, while we cling blindly to our old phraseology and fill our minds with older needs. While we recognize that industry is no longer local and that, in government, sectional interests have been subjected to general control, we may be harboring spiritual and intellectual provincialism, a condition in which men and women in the same locality are divided into classes by impervious walls which belie real nationalism and already betoken disintegration. The old sectionalism was geographic; men were separated by state lines or by physiographic influences. The new sectionalism has itself continental dimensions; it sees no surveyor's lines or natural boundaries; in a way, though chiefly caused by industry, it is not even materialistic. The lines of the old nationalism ran outward through the people from one end of the land to the other; the newest must run from the top downward and from the bottom upward; it must make for real unity and human homogeneity. The old sectionalism was based on misunderstanding, on the failure of each section to understand the other; common understanding is as inconsistent with separateness as integration is with disintegration. The new sectionalism likewise rests on intellectual and spiritual misunderstanding; it exists because there is defective community of sentiment; and, if the nation is to be a nation, ideas must play freely up and down, through and through; without this interplay we may as well cast all our old words into the scrap heap;

for a community without the possession of a common domain is not a community at all.

In these last words, I am not pleading for socialism, for communism in physical properties, for anarchy, or for anything save nationalism in a real spiritual sense. Indeed, as a laborer in the field of history, I ought not, I suppose, to be pleading for anything; but I feel free to suppose that, as citizens as well as historians, we are interested in the vicissitudes of democracy and all its connotations, and one cannot help saying that for us now, the old-time squatter in the wilderness, that genius of American democracy, filled with his hopes and his purposes, looms larger than ever before, and we question with renewed interest how he fared in the decades gone by and how he changed as the wilderness gave place to farm, factory, and school, and as the social order about him lost its primitive simplicity and immediateness. The history of a popular state must be no other, at its inmost heart, than the story of the attempt to become and to remain a popular state.

ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN.

THE GOVERNMENT OF NORMANDY UNDER HENRY II.

II.

AFTER 1164 the point of view of our study must be somewhat shifted. Thanks to a series of legislative monuments and treatises which have no Norman analogues, we can trace with some confidence the course of English constitutional development, while our knowledge of Norman affairs is too scanty to permit following the evolution of institutions or policies. The most that we can attempt is to reconstruct the chief elements of judicial and fiscal organization and procedure, in the hope of furnishing an instructive parallel to better known English conditions.

The turning-point in the constitutional history of Normandy during the latter part of Henry's reign is the year 1176, when the death of the seneschal and justiciar, William de Courcy,¹ led the king to appoint in his place as ruler of Normandy Richard of Ilchester, bishop of Winchester, long a trusted officer of the English Exchequer, where he had charge of a special roll and proved himself particularly "alert and businesslike in reckonings and the writing of rolls and writs".² Very possibly the constitutional development of Normandy may have lagged behind that of England in the busy years which intervened between the Constitutions of Clarendon and the Assize of Northampton; very likely its administration had fallen into disorder after the rebellion of 1173; certain it is that Richard was excellently qualified by talent and experience to undertake the reorganization of governmental business which seems to have been effected during the year and a half which he now spent in Normandy.

¹ On whom see Delisle, *Recueil des Actes de Henri II. Roi d'Angleterre et Duc de Normandie concernant les Provinces Françaises et les Affaires de France*, Introduction, pp. 476-478.

² *Dialogus*, I. 5 (Oxford ed., p. 77). On Richard see Miss Norgate, in *Dictionary of National Biography*, XLVIII. 194; Delisle, 431-434; Poole, *The Exchequer in the Twelfth Century*, pp. 116 ff. It is not quite true, as Miss Norgate says, that we have no trace of his activity during his sojourn in Normandy. He is mentioned in three documents: a charter of Philippa Rosel given at the Exchequer in 1176 (original in British Museum, Add. Ch. 15278; Round, no. 517); an assize which he held at Caen in January, 1177 (*Livre Noir de Bayeux*, no. 95; Delisle, p. 347); and an assize held at Montfort "quo tempore Richardus Wintoniensis episcopus in Normannia post regem erat iudex et maior iustitia" (Valin, *Le Duc de Normandie et sa Cour*, p. 272). A tallage levied by him is still carried on the roll of 1180 (Stapleton, *Magni Rotuli Scaccarii Normanniae sub Regibus Angliae*, I. 74).

It is not without significance that the roll of 1176 remained the basis of reckoning for more than twenty years, and that from this year we begin to follow with some clearness and continuity the judicial work of the Norman Exchequer.

It has indeed been maintained that the term exchequer does not previously occur in Normandy, and hence that Richard is the creator of the institution.³ The author of the *Dialogus*, however, who began his treatise while Richard was in Normandy, refers to the Norman Exchequer as an ancient institution, as old perhaps as the Conqueror,⁴ under whom we can trace the regular accounting for the ferm of the *vicomtés* which is the essence of such a fiscal system;⁵ and the name *scaccarium* occurs in 1171⁶ and in a notice of Henry I.'s reign discovered by Round.⁷ At what epoch there was introduced the distinctive method of reckoning which gave the Exchequer its name, is an even darker problem in Normandy than in England. According to an ingenious conjecture of Poole,⁸ the employment of the abacus for balancing the royal accounts came to England from the schools of Laon in the reign of Henry I. To me the epoch of its introduction seems probably earlier and connected with the abacists of Lorraine in the preceding century;⁹ but in any case the Eng-

³ Valin, pp. 116-136. On Valin's own showing we can hardly imagine Richard creating the Exchequer between his arrival toward Michaelmas of 1176 and the regular session of that body, doubtless also at Michaelmas, mentioned in the Rosel charter of that year (see the preceding note).

⁴ I. 4 (Oxford ed.), p. 66.

⁵ AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XIV. 464-468 (1909); *English Historical Review*, XXIV. 223 (1909), XXVI. 328 (1911) (a *terra data* under the Conqueror). For accounts which run far back of 1176 see Stapleton, I. 12, 92, 94. On the administrative organization as the essence of the Exchequer cf. Liebermann, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXVIII. 153 (1913).

⁶ Delisle, p. 345; cf. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXVI. 326-328 (1911). No reliance can be placed on the early mention of the Exchequer in a highly suspicious document for St. Evroul, Round, nos. 638, 639; Delisle, p. 316. There is an important document from the Exchequer, 1178-1180 (Round, no. 1123), which Valin overlooks. His misreading of "*rotulis trium annorum*" (p. 135) as a single roll hardly requires comment.

⁷ *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XIV. 426 (1899). Valin labors hard to explain away this document, which upsets his whole theory of the origin and functions of the Exchequer, on the ground that it was drawn up, probably later, by a canon of Merton who introduced English terminology. Taken apart from any preconceived theory, however, it is strictly parallel to the other notices concerning the lands of Bernard the Scribe, all of which are plainly contemporary records of transactions of the reign of Henry I. and show no trace of tampering. The document is accepted by Poole and Powicke. For a parallel form of 1199 see the facsimile in *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XV.

⁸ Poole, *The Exchequer in the Twelfth Century*, pp. 42-59.

⁹ See my article on "The Abacus and the King's Curia", *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXVII. 101-106 (1912). Norman clerks also were in relations with the schools of Lorraine, Ordericus, III. 265.

lish evidence antedates the Norman, and the process may very well be, as Poole urges, "from England to Normandy, not from Normandy to England".

The absence of earlier rolls deprives us of all basis for fixing the nature of Bishop Richard's reforms, which probably had less to do with the mechanism of administration than with the re-establishment of order in the finances through the collection of back accounts—arrearages of seven, fifteen, even twenty years meet us in the roll of 1180¹⁰—the revision of the farms, and the change of officials which is recorded in 1177.¹¹ Whatever Richard accomplished, he did not make the Norman Exchequer a copy of the English, for in 1178–1179 the *Dialogue* tells us that the two bodies differed "in many points and wellnigh in the most important".¹²

What these great differences were, apart from the absence of blank farm in Normandy, it is impossible to say, for we have no Norman *Dialogue*. The terms of the Norman Exchequer are the same as the English, Easter and Michaelmas; the officers are likewise called barons; the place is fixed at Caen, where the principal treasury was.¹³ One point of divergence which appears from the rolls is that in Normandy each section begins with a statement of the total amount due, whereas in the Pipe Rolls, until 8 Richard I., this can only be discovered by computation.¹⁴ Variation in nomenclature is also seen in the Norman heading *misericordie, promissiones et fines*, corresponding to the *placita, conventiones*, and *oblata* of the English record. In general, however, the two sets of rolls rest upon the same fundamental system of accounting,¹⁵ the greater detail and subdivision of the Norman roll resulting from the existence of a set of local areas much more complex and irregular than

¹⁰ Stapleton, I. 12, 92, 94.

¹¹ Benedict of Peterborough, I. 198. The words of Ralph de Diceto (I. 424) "*fiscalia diligenter recensens*" need mean no more than is here suggested. On these points I am glad to find myself in agreement with Professor Powicke (pp. 73–75, 85).

¹² I. 4 (p. 66).

¹³ That the principal treasury was at Caen as early as 1172 is clear from Robert of Torigni's account (II. 297) of the deposit there of the barons' returns of that year. See also Stapleton, I. 56, and another mention on page 110, where the treasury at Rouen is likewise important. Treasure was also kept at Falaise (*ibid.*, I. 39), which had been the principal place of deposit under Henry I. (Robert of Torigni, I. 200; Ordericus, V. 50), and at Argentan (Delisle, p. 334). On the use of castles for the custody of treasure see Round's introduction to the *Pipe Roll of 28 Henry II.*, p. xxiv.

¹⁴ Stapleton, I. xi; Poole, *The Exchequer in the Twelfth Century*, p. 130.

¹⁵ Powicke, p. 74, notes as an example the parallel distinction "between these fines and amercements for which the bailiff is responsible personally, and those for which the persons concerned are responsible".

the English shires. The older *vicomté* and *prévôté* persist in spite of the superposition of the newer *bailliage*; ¹⁶ many of the tithes and fixed allowances go back to the Conqueror's time or even earlier, ¹⁷ and the ferm, less affected by *terre date* than in England, seems to have undergone little change except in the case of important commercial centres like Rouen, Caen, and Dieppe. ¹⁸ The whole substructure of ducal finance was evidently very ancient, and for that reason in Henry's time quite inadequate, and the rolls show clearly that, as in England, the chief means for supplementing it were found in the administration of civil and criminal justice. However interesting it might be to follow out in detail the points of agreement and divergence in the methods of the two Exchequers, the fact of primary importance is that, so far as northern Europe is concerned, England and Normandy stand in a group by themselves, well in advance of all their neighbors in the development of a money economy and in the mechanism of fiscal administration.

As regards its functions as a court, it has recently been argued ¹⁹ that the Exchequer of the Norman dukes was in no sense a judicial body and was in no wise connected with the later *Échiquier de Normandie*. This view is a natural reaction against those writers who approached the earlier institution with the ideas of an age when the Exchequer was known only as a court, but it assumes a breach in that continuity of law and institutions which is in general so noteworthy in passing from Angevin to Capetian Normandy, and it does not fully realize the fluidity of the Anglo-Norman *curia*. ²⁰ What we seem rather to find is a *curia* which sits for fiscal purposes at Caen and for judicial purposes at various places in the duchy, and which, when Philip Augustus transfers its fiscal duties to Paris, retains its judicial functions and its Anglo-Norman name. The chief thing to avoid in tracing its history is the projection back into the Anglo-Norman period of the more fully organized *Échiquier* which we know from the *Grand Coutumier* and the *arrêts* of the thirteenth century. From the reigns of Henry II. and Richard a small but definite body of cases furnishes conclusive evidence of the activity of the Exchequer in judicial matters, and indicates that there was no

¹⁶ On the whole subject of local geography, see Powicke, pp. 61-79, 103-119.

¹⁷ AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XIV. 465-467; *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXIV. 223 (1909).

¹⁸ *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXIV. 222-224 (1909); Stapleton, I. 56, 68, 70.

¹⁹ Valin, pp. 137-139, 249-251, the two passages are not wholly consistent. See, *contra*, Powicke, *Loss of Normandy*, pp. 85, 398.

²⁰ On the fundamental identity of *curia*, Exchequer, and assizes, see Fréville, "Étude sur l'Organisation Judiciaire en Normandie aux XII^e et XIII^e Siècles", *Nouvelle Revue Historique de Droit*, 1912, p. 683.

clear distinction between its competence and that of the *curia regis*.²¹ As in England in the same period,²² it seems probable that the difference was essentially one of place: when the *curia* sat in the Exchequer chamber at Caen, it was said to sit at the Exchequer, when it sat elsewhere it was called simply the *curia*. Certainly the distinction was not, at least among the higher officers, one of personnel, for the same men appear at one time as barons, or justices,²³ of the Exchequer and at another as justices holding assizes in various parts of Normandy.²⁴ In the sessions of the Exchequer the seneschal naturally presided, accompanied by certain men who bear the title of barons or justices, but in the documents are not always distinguishable from the other barons and clerks in attendance. In a charter of 1178-1180,²⁵ besides William Fitz Ralph the seneschal, we find as barons, William de Hummet, the constable, Master Walter of Coutances, who had served as clerk of the king's *camera* and keeper of the seal, and was perhaps treasurer of Normandy,²⁶ Osbert de la

²¹ For cases and transactions before the Exchequer in this period see *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XV. 198-201; Delisle, p. 349; Valin, pièces, nos. 19, 24, 25, 28; Round, nos. 309, 310, 438, 461, 485 (another version in MS. Lat. 10086, f. 109v), 509 (also in the British Museum, Add. Ch. 15289, no. 2), 517 (original in Add. Ch. 15278; some additional witnesses in the confirmation in Archives of the Calvados, H. 322, no. 3), 560, 606 (where the witnesses are omitted; original in Archives of the Calvados, H. 6607, 301-303), 608, 1123; cartulary of Fécamp, f. 25 (letter of Archbishop of Rouen to William Fitz Ralph and the other barons of the Exchequer notifying them of the settlement of a question of presentation in the court of the Bishop of Bayeux); Cartulaire de Normandie, f. 68v (*infra*, note 23); Archives of the Calvados, H. 5716, 6607 (78-83, 309), 6653 (338-342), 6672 (293-301), 6679 (186-191), 7707; Archives of the Orne, H. 3916 (*infra*, note 28); and the following passage in Richard's great confirmation of the privileges of St. Stephen's: "Recuperavit idem abbas Willelmus, d. 1179] super Robertum de Veim in curia H. regis patris nostri apud Cadomum hereditagium quod idem Robertus clamabat in tenendo manerio de Veim et de Sancto Leonardo, et super Robertum de Briecuria ecclesiam Sancti Andree de Vilers de qua monachos violenter dissaisierat sed iuditio baronum qui erant ad scaccarium apud Cadomum adiudicata est ecclesia predicta Sancto Stephano et restituta". Archives of the Calvados, H. 1836; cf. Deville, *Analyse*, p. 52. Most of these documents relate to agreements or acknowledgments before the Exchequer, but good examples of judicial proceedings will be found in the last extract; in Valin, nos. 24, 25, 28; in Round, nos. 309, 310, 438; and in the documents given in facsimile in *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XV.

²² Poole, *The Exchequer in the Twelfth Century*, pp. 174-182; cf. Adams, in *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, XVIII. 357 (1913).

²³ "Hoc autem factum fuit apud Cadomum ad scaccarium coram iusticiis domini regis tempore Willelmi filii Radulfi senescalli Normannie". Cartulaire de Normandie, f. 68v. So also in Valin, nos. 19, 24; Round, nos. 438, 509, 517, 1123.

²⁴ See the list of assizes, *infra*, appendix.

²⁵ *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XXX. 672 (cf. XIX. 66); Round, no. 1123.

²⁶ Delisle, pp. 106-113. The title "thesaurarius Rothomagensis" (Delisle, p. 101; Round, no. 34) probably means treasurer of the cathedral rather than

Heuse, constable of Cherbourg, Ranulf de Grandval, Richard Giffard, and Gilbert Pipart, justiciars of the king, the last two having served as justices in England and as barons of the Norman Exchequer under Richard of Winchester.²⁷ Later we find most frequently Haimo the butler, the justices William de Mara and Richard Silvain, Jordan de Landa, and certain clerks, of whom as many as four appear in one charter of the period.²⁸ Most of these clerks are only names to us, but we can follow with some clearness two members of the clerical family of Arri, Roger, canon of Bayeux since the early years of Henry's reign and a regular witness in records of the *curia* and Exchequer from 1164 to 1191,²⁹ and Anquetil, who attests less frequently but receives a livery as clerk of the Exchequer as late as 1198;³⁰ while another type appears in William Calix, a constant witness from the time of Richard of Ilchester, a responsible disbursing officer in the roll of 1184, and a large money-lender on his own account, forfeiting to the crown at his death a mass of chattels and pledges³¹ which suggests on a smaller scale the operations of that arch-usurer William Cade.³² The rolls show other ecclesiastics active in the business of the Exchequer, notably the king's chancellor, Ralph of Wanneville, later bishop of Lisieux and treasurer of Normandy;³³ but until Henry's faithful clerks are rewarded with the sees of

royal treasurer at Rouen; but Ralph of Wanneville, treasurer of Rouen, was also treasurer of Normandy (Round, no. 21; Stapleton, I. 110), and we know that the office of ducal treasurer had been combined with a canonry in the cathedral from the time of Henry I. (*Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXIV. 224-226, 1909). There are relations between the duke and the treasurer of Avranches (Delisle, p. 346) and Bayeux (*AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, XIV. 471, 1909; *Livre Noir*, nos. 13, 138, 271, 275) which may have had some significance. For the conversion of the plate of Rouen cathedral to the uses of Henry II. see MS. Rouen 1405, f. 18 (Round, no. 274).

²⁷ Delisle, pp. 376, 428.

²⁸ Grant of Willelmus de Mool to the nuns of Almenesches, Archives of the Orne, H. 3916: "Actum est hoc apud Cadomum ad scacarium coram Willelmo filio Radulfi tunc Normannie senescallo, testibus his: Anschetillo de Arre, Radulfo de Lexoviis, Daniele, magistro Gaufrredo de Cortone clericis de scacario, R. abbate Sancti Andree de Gofer, Ricardo Hartie, Turofredo de Cyerni, Willelmo filio comitis Johannis, Henrico de Mool, Radulfo de Rupetra, Ricardo de Argenciis, Radulfo Martel, et aliis pluribus".

²⁹ Part I., note 62; *Livre Noir*, nos. 45, 73, 128, 129, 135, 139, 182, 442; Round, nos. 432, 435, 437, 438, 456, 461, 485, 509, 1446, 1447, 1451; the Exchequer notices cited in note 21; and the list of assizes below, p. 289.

³⁰ Stapleton, I. 145, 225, II. 376, 384; and the lists just cited.

³¹ Round, no. 517; Stapleton, I. cli, 110, 129, 130, 145, 170, 171, 183, 194-198, 226, 228, 240, II. 375, 379 (the Countess of Richmond as a debtor), 465-469; and the lists.

³² On whom see *English Historical Review*, XXVIII. 209-227, 522-527, 730-732 (1913).

³³ Delisle, pp. 99-103.

Évreux, Lisieux, and Rouen toward the close of the reign, the higher clergy are less prominent in the administration than they were in his earlier years.

Of those who serve the king in Normandy many have served or will serve him elsewhere; his officers and treasure are passing to and fro across the Channel; his household is ever on the march, and some elements in it are common to the whole Plantagenet empire; yet Normandy has also officers of its own. Some are clerks, such as the treasurer,³⁴ the subordinates in the Exchequer,³⁵ and the chaplains of the great castles;³⁶ some are serjeants, acting as ushers,³⁷ money-changers,³⁸ writers,³⁹ marshals,⁴⁰ pantlers,⁴¹ and larderers;⁴² and for local government there are the keepers of jails, parks, and forests⁴³ and fairs,⁴⁴ as well as the *vicomtes*, *prévôts*, *baillis*, and constables upon whom the whole system rested—in all a multitude of officials, compared by Peter of Blois to an army of locusts,⁴⁵ with the bureaucratic element rapidly gaining on the feudal in a way which anticipates the *gens du roi* of the thirteenth century.

Throughout the administration of justice the seneschal is the all-important figure. Something of his enhanced importance was doubtless due to the absences of Henry and Richard and the decline of the personal justice of the sovereign, but something must also

³⁴ The relation of the treasurer to the chamberlain on the one hand and to the custody of local treasure on the other is not perfectly clear. In the rolls of 1180 and following the Norman treasurer has an assured income unconnected with service in the king's household and consisting of the tithes of the *vicomtiés* of Fécamp, Caux, Auge, Lieuvin, Roumois, and the country between Risle and Seine, and of the great forests of the Seine valley. Certain of these can be found in the possession of Henry I.'s treasurer, and their antiquity and situation may point to an even earlier origin. See *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXIV. 224 f. (1909). The duke's chaplain at Bayeux similarly had the tithe of the regards of the forest of Vernai (Stapleton, I. 5). Can this have some connection with a local treasury (*supra*, note 26)?

³⁵ *Supra*, notes 28–31; and *cf.* the clerks who appear in the roll of 1180, pp. 37, 56–58.

³⁶ Stapleton, I. 5, 7, 90; *Rotuli Normannie*, pp. 7, 23; *Rotuli Cartarum*, pp. 69, 107.

³⁷ Valin, p. 151, note 3; *Rotuli Cartarum*, p. 82; Eyton, *Court, Household, and Itinerary of Henry II.*, p. 9.

³⁸ Delisle, nos. 199, 381, 527; Stapleton, I. 77; "Symon cambitor tunc prepositus Andeleii" in cartulary of Mortemer (MS. Lat. 18369), f. 103 (1168).

³⁹ Hereditary scribe *prepositure Cadomi* in *Olm* (ed. Beugnot), I. 417.

⁴⁰ Delisle, *Cartulaire Normand*, no. 13; *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXVII. 442 (1913).

⁴¹ Delisle, no. 14. *Cf.* Round, *King's Serjeants*, pp. 199–201.

⁴² Stapleton, I. 30, 99, 274, II. 471, 572 f.; *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, XI. 410, note 14.

⁴³ Delisle, *Cartulaire*, no. 13; *id.*, *Henri II.*, nos. 120, 121, p. 209.

⁴⁴ Delisle, *Henri II.*, pp. 210, 271, 346.

⁴⁵ *Epistolae*, no. 93, in Migne, *Patrologia*, CCVII. 298.

be ascribed to the personality of William Fitz Ralph, who in 1178 came fresh from his experience as itinerant justice in England and held the office until his death in 1200, exerting an influence upon Norman law which may still be traced in the *Très Ancien Coutumier*.⁴⁶ As the *alter ego* of the king the seneschal was the head of the whole judicial system, and in his sovereign's absence he alone could preside in the judgment of those who had the privilege of appearing only before the duke or his chief justiciar.⁴⁷ We find him holding court, not only at Caen, where the traces of his activity are naturally better preserved, but at Argentan, Bernai, Longueville, Neufchâtel, St. Wandrille, and Rouen. With him sit such men as William de Mara, Richard Giffart, Richard of Argences, and John d'Éraines, archdeacon of Séez, who also in groups of two or three hold assizes in various parts of Normandy.⁴⁸ With no help from the Exchequer Rolls and only scattered references in the charters, it is impossible to define the composition of these assizes or determine how often they were held. In the documents the list of justices is often incomplete, and they are frequently indistinguishable from the other witnesses; yet we can identify many of them with the *baillis* and constables who meet us in the rolls, and occasionally an assize is held by a group of constables covering a considerable district. According to the custom of 1199-1200, a doubtful witness upon such points, assizes are held once or twice a year in each *vicomté* and are attended by the ducal officers within the district and by the local lords, who are forbidden to hold their own courts during the session of the assize.⁴⁹ Full rolls are kept of the cases considered and the names of the jurors, and the clerks have also their little parchments to record the various fines and payments.⁵⁰ The theory still survives that all chattels of offenders are forfeited to the duke, for "the

⁴⁶ Delisle, pp. 219-220, 481-483; Tardif, *Très Ancien Coutumier*, p. 105; Valin, pp. 160-163, where the fines carried in later Pipe Rolls are wrongly taken as evidence that William was justice in England after 1178. The Norman roll of 1180 (pp. 56, 57) shows that he received pay for the full year 1179/80 and administered justice in a preceding year.

⁴⁷ For examples see Delisle, pp. 162, 219.

⁴⁸ See below, p. 290.

⁴⁹ *Très Ancien Coutumier*, cc. 25-29, 36, 37, 44, 55, 56; Robert of Torigni, II. 117; Fréville has shown (*Nouvelle Revue Historique de Droit*, 1912, pp. 715-724) that the *Très Ancien Coutumier* cannot be taken as an unmixed source for the judicial organization of the Plantagenet period; its statements respecting law and procedure are less likely to have been affected by French influence. The preponderance of the official element in the administration of justice in the twelfth century is well brought out by Fréville (pp. 682 ff.), who, however, goes too far in excluding the non-professional element. His studies of the meaning of the word baron in this period are worth pursuing further.

⁵⁰ *Très Ancien Coutumier*, cc. 25, 28, 29, 65.

function of the sworn affearors is to declare what goods the offender has";⁵¹ but there are maximum payments for the various classes of society, and knight and peasant enjoy exemption of their arms and means of livelihood in a way which suggests the well-known clause of *Magna Carta*.⁵² The justices have a reputation for extortion on technical pretexts,⁵³ and the Exchequer Rolls show them bent on upholding the dignity and authority of their court by fines for contradiction and foolish speaking, for leaving its session without permission, and for disregarding or transgressing its decrees.⁵⁴ Even lords of the rank of Hugh de Longchamp and Hugh de Gournay are heavily mulcted for neglecting the summons to the regard of the forest.⁵⁵

The ordinary local courts of the *vicomte* and *bailli* are not mentioned in the *Très Ancien Coutumier* and have left few traces in the charters. Early in the reign they had been ordered to meet once a month;⁵⁶ in the Avranchin the *vicomte* held pleas three times a year in Ardevon and Genest.⁵⁷ Once the sole agent of the duke in all departments of local administration, the *vicomte* saw his power greatly reduced by the development of the itinerant justices, and we have no means of knowing just what he still retained under the pleas which remained a constituent element of his farm. The newer jurisdictions of the *bailli* and constable have also to be reckoned with, and there were probably differences of local custom as well as changes in the course of the Angevin period. Thus the pleas of the sword regularly stood outside of the local farm⁵⁸ and fell naturally to the itinerant justices, yet in the district of Falaise a charter of Henry II. specifically reserves them to the *baillis*.⁵⁹ The local officers also possessed a minor civil jurisdiction, as we see from a writ in which Henry orders the constable and *baillis* of Cherbourg to do full justice

⁵¹ Pollock and Maitland, *History of English Law* (second ed.), II. 513.

⁵² *Très Ancien Coutumier*, cc. 55, 56; *Magna Carta*, c. 20; and on its interpretation, Tait and Pollard, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXVII. 720-728 (1912), XXVIII. 117 (1913).

⁵³ *Très Ancien Coutumier*, c. 65.

⁵⁴ Stapleton, I. 5, 16, 21, 34, 41, 51, 54, 58, 80, 86, 113, 116.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, I. 59, 74. On pleas of the forest see the Fécamp cartulary (MS. Rouen 1207), f. 36v.

⁵⁶ Robert of Torigni, II. 180; *ante*, part I. of this article, p. 37.

⁵⁷ Delisle, p. 346. Cf. the pleas held by Nigel, seneschal of Mortain, Stapleton, I. lxxv, 11; Delisle, p. 408.

⁵⁸ This is specifically stated for the Hiesmois (see the following note), for the castle of Gaillon (Delisle, *Cartulaire Normand*, no. 120), and for the *vicomté* of Bonneville and the *prévôtés* of Falaise and Domfront (*ibid.*, no. 111).

⁵⁹ *Cartulaire de Fontenay-le-Marmion* (ed. Saige), no. 1; Delisle, no. 509; cf. Valin, p. 227. Later they are held here by the itinerant justices, *Rotuli Normannie*, p. 20.

in a certain case unless the land in question be a knight's fee or a burgage of more than a hundred shillings' annual value, in which event the matter doubtless went to the higher court.⁶⁰ In general, however, the local writs are administrative rather than judicial,⁶¹ and throw no light on the work of the local courts.

With respect to the criminal jurisdiction of the duke, we have a list of pleas of the sword drawn up before 1174,⁶² elaborated at certain points in the earlier part of the *Très Ancien Coutumier*,⁶³ and confirmed by the fines recorded in the Exchequer Rolls and the cases reserved by Henry in his charters.⁶⁴ The enumeration includes murder and slaying, mayhem, robbery, arson, rape, and the plotted assault, offenses against the peace of the house, the plow, the duke's highway and the duke's court, against his army and his coinage. In large measure this list goes back to the Conqueror's time, when many of these pleas had already been granted to the great immunists, lay and ecclesiastical, who still continued to retain them under Henry.⁶⁵ Barons, however, whose courts encroach on the duke's jurisdiction must expect to be fined by his justices,⁶⁶ as must

⁶⁰ "H. Dei gratia rex Anglorum et dux Normannorum et Aquitaniorum et comes Andegavensium constabulario et baillivis suis re Cesarisburgo salutem. Precipio vobis quod sine dilatione plenum rectum teneatis priori et canonicis sancte Marie de Voto iuxta Cesarisburgum de terra que fuit Preisie apud Cesarisburgum et dedomo quam ipsa eis dedit, quas Willhelmus Pichard et uxor Rither' eis difforciant, nisi sit feodum lorice vel burgagium quod valeat plusquam .i.c. solidos per annum. Et nisi feceritis iusticia mea Normannie faciat, ne amplius inde clamorem audiam pro defectu recti. Teste Hugone Bardulf dapifero apud Bonamvillam." Original, with fragment of *simple queue*, in Archives of the Manche, H. 1963. Printed from a poor copy by Bigelow, *History of Procedure*, p. 367; Round, no. 949; Delisle, no. 494 (1185-1189). A controversy concerning a mill is settled June 30, 1175, "in presentia W. de Huechon conestabularii regis": *Livre Elanc* of St. Martin of Séz, f. 13. Cf. the constable of Mortain, part I., note 72.

⁶¹ For examples see Round, nos. 25, 26, 131, 205-207, 492 (where the original has "Beiesino" in the address), 939, 1282; Delisle, pp. 164 f., 179 f.

⁶² *Très Ancien Coutumier*, c. 70. For the date see part I. of this article, note 22 (XX. 28).

⁶³ *Très Ancien Coutumier*, cc. 15, 16, 35, 53, 54, 58, 59; cf. Pollock and Maitland, II. 455.

⁶⁴ Round, nos. 375, 382, 420; Delisle, *Cartulaire Normand*, no. 16; *id.*, *Henri II.*, no. 495.

⁶⁵ *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXIII. 502-508 (1908); AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XIV. 460-462 (1909). Cf. Powicke, pp. 80 ff.

⁶⁶ "Pro placitis ensis iniuste captis", Stapleton, I. 21. "Pro duello latrocinii male servato in curia sua. . . pro duello de combustione male servato in curia sua", *ibid.*, I. 123. On the right of barons to hold pleas of the sword see AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XIV. 461 (1909); Valin, pp. 220 ff.; Powicke, pp. 80-88. That the justices might sit in franchise courts is seen from a charter of John for William of Briouze (*Rotuli Normannie*, p. 20; see Powicke, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXII. 18, 1907) and from the following extract from the cartulary of Savigny (f. 27v): "Fidelibus universis Guillelmus Avenel salutem. Sciatis quod Robertus pincerna et Guillelmus frater eius in presentia mea in curia comitis in

those who seek to settle such crimes out of court.⁶⁷ Since the early years of the reign men are fleeing the realm for murder, robbery, and similar offenses, which already bear the name of felonies,⁶⁸ and their chattels become a large element in the ducal revenues.⁶⁹ Nothing is said of their accusation by a jury of presentment, but we have seen reason for thinking that such juries were in use after 1159,⁷⁰ and the chattels of those who fail at the ordeal by water are accounted for in the roll of 1180 as they are in the Pipe Rolls after the Assize of Clarendon.⁷¹ The pleas of the crown are viewed as a source of income analogous to the various portions of the ducal demesne; in the Avranchin, at least, they are in charge of a special officer, or coroner, as early as 1171.⁷²

In civil matters the ducal courts had cognizance of disputes concerning church property, so far as these did not come under ecclesiastical jurisdiction,⁷³ and of such suits concerning land as involved the use of the recognition. From early times the property of churches and monasteries had been assimilated to the duke's own demesne (*sicut res mea dominica*) and charters repeatedly declare that particular establishments shall be impleaded only in the king's

plenaria assissa coram baronibus domini regis concesserunt monachis Savigneii . . . in manu mea qui tunc eram senescallus domini comitis Moretonii." Cf. the justices in the court of the Bishop of Lisieux, part I. of this article, note 105 (XX. 41). The baron's jealousy of losing his court is illustrated by the following: "B. de Sancto Walerico maiori et paribus communie Rothomagensis salutem et magnum amorem. Audiui quod vos misistis in placitum Walterum fratrem meum de masura mea que iuxta atrium beate Marie de Rothomago. Unde non parum miror, cum non defecerim alicui de recto tenendo. Mando igitur vobis quod dimittatis mihi curiam meam sicut alii barones regis vel etiam minores habent, quia libenter quando requisitus fuero rectum faciam". Cartulary of the chapter of Rouen (MS. Rouen 1093), f. 112.

⁶⁷ Stapleton, I. 25-27, 32; cf. 26, 51; *Très Ancien Coutumier*, c. 36.

⁶⁸ "Nisi sint fugitivi de terra mea pro muldro vel furto vel alio scelere": charter of Henry for Fécamp, not later than 1162, in Valin, p. 269; Delisle, no. 146; Round, no. 133, where a curious misreading of *indictum* makes the document relate to a court instead of a fair. In another charter of 1162 for Fécamp we have (Delisle, no. 147): "Habeant meam firmam pacem in eundo morando redeundo nisi nominati calumpniati fuerint de proditione vel feloniam."

⁶⁹ See the *catalla fugitivorum* in Stapleton, I. 4, 7, 10-12, 15, 16, 22, 23, 27, 29, 32-34, 43, 49, 55, 58, 72, 89, 94; Delisle, pp. 335, 339, 340, 343; and cf. *Très Ancien Coutumier*, cc. 36, 37. In the cartulary of La Trinité de Caen, MS. Lat. 5650, f. 84v, we read in an inquest of this reign: "De feodo Rogeri Terrici fugitivi pro latrocinio inquirendum est ibidem."

⁷⁰ *Supra*, part I., p. 37.

⁷¹ Stapleton, I. 62; and for England, Stubbs, *Benedictus*, II. lxii, note.

⁷² Delisle, p. 346; *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXV. 710 f. (1910), XXVI. 326 f. (1911). For mention of coroners in England before 1194, see Gross, *Coroners' Rolls*, pp. xv-xix.

⁷³ *Très Ancien Coutumier*, c. 53.

court, in some cases only before him or his principal justiciar.⁷⁴ The protection of possession by the duke, praised especially by the author of the first part of the *Très Ancien Coutumier* as a defense of the poor against the rich and powerful, is secured, as in England, by recourse to twelve lawful men of the vicinage. The possessory assizes described in this treatise⁷⁵ correspond to the four English assizes, and the Exchequer Rolls furnish abundant evidence that they were in current use by 1180.⁷⁶ On the other hand the principle that no man should answer for the title of his free tenement without royal writ does not seem to have been as broadly recognized in Normandy as in England, nor do we find anything which bears the name of the grand assize;⁷⁷ but its Norman analogues, the *breve de stabilia* and *breve de superdemanda*, appear in the early Exchequer Rolls,⁷⁸ as does also the writ of right.⁷⁹ In the few instances where comparison with Glanvill is possible, the Norman writs seem to have preserved their individuality of form, while showing general agreement in substance. Even in the duke's court, the law of Normandy has its differences from the law which is being made beyond the Channel, nor can we see that its development shows any dependence upon the law of England.

At this point our sketch of Norman institutions under Henry II. must draw to a close. The evidence is all too scanty, and while it would be easy to piece it out with English or French parallels, the result would not be Norman. It would be interesting also, were it possible, to seek to ascertain what, in an institutional sense, Normandy had given and received during a century and a quarter of union with England and during more than a generation of membership in the Plantagenet empire. Certainly the movement was not all in one direction. If the two chief figures in Norman administration in Henry's later years, Richard of Ilchester and William Fitz Ralph, had served an English apprenticeship, there had earlier in the reign been Norman precedents for Henry's English legislation.

⁷⁴ Brunner, *Schwurgerichte*, p. 238 ff.; Delisle, pp. 162, 219.

⁷⁵ Cc. 7, 16-19, 21, 23, 57. See Brunner, c. 15, who, however, points out that the Norman parallel to the assize *utrum*, the *breve de feodo et elemosina*, is a petitory writ.

⁷⁶ E.g., Stapleton, I. 5, 12, 13, 19, 64, 65, 96, cf. 114, 115 (1184). Cf. Brunner, p. 307.

⁷⁷ Brunner, pp. 410-416.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 312-317; Stapleton, I. 11, 13, 29; Delisle, p. 339; *Très Ancien Coutumier*, c. 85. Tardif (p. lxxv) points out that the appearance of the seneschal's name in these writs carries them back of 1204, when the office was abolished.

⁷⁹ *Très Ancien Coutumier*, c. 30; and the numerous payments in the rolls *pro recto habendo*.

If the English military inquest of 1166 preceded the Norman returns of 1172, the Assize of Arms and the ordinance for the Saladin tithe were first promulgated for the king's Continental dominions. The order of these measures may have been a matter of chance, for to a man of Henry's temperament it mattered little where an experiment was first tried, but it was impossible to administer a great empire upon his system without using the experience gained in one region for the advantage of another. There was wisdom in Geoffrey's parting admonition to his son against the transfer of customs and institutions from one part of his realm to another,⁸⁰ but so long as there was a common element in the administration and frequent interchange of officers between different regions, it could not be fully heeded. A certain amount of give and take there must inevitably have been, and now and then it can definitely be traced. On the other hand, it must not be supposed that there was any general assimilation, which would have been a still greater impossibility. Normandy preserved and carried over into the French kingdom its individuality of law and character, and as a model of vigorous and centralized administration it seems to have affected the government of Philip Augustus in ways which are still dark to us. When that chapter of constitutional history comes to be written, if it ever can be written, it will illustrate from still another side the permanent importance of the creative statesmanship of the Norman dukes.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

APPENDIX

The roll of 1180, unlike the contemporary Pipe Rolls, throws no light upon the judges' circuits, save for the mention of William Fitz Ralph on page 57 and of Geoffrey le Moine on page 52 (*cf.* p. 78 and Round, no. 517); such indications are more abundant in the roll of 1195. The following list includes such assizes as I have noted in the latter part of Henry's reign and the early years of Richard; in them William Fitz Ralph regularly has the title of seneschal:

1. 1177, January; Caen. Richard, bishop of Winchester, Simon de Tornebu, Robert Marmion, William de Glanville as justices. *Livre Noir*, no. 95; Delisle, p. 347; Round, no. 1446.

2. 1176-1178; Montfort. Justices: William de Mara, *vicomte* of Ste.-Mère Église, William Malet, Hugh de Cressi, Seher de Quinci, Alvered de S. Martin, constables respectively of Pontaudemer, Rouen, Nonancourt, and Neufchâtel (Drincourt). Published incorrectly from the original in the Archives of the Seine-Inférieure by Valin, p. 271.

3. No date; Montfort. "Ista autem donatio facta est apud Montemfortem et recitata in plena asisia coram iusticiis domini regis, scilicet Seherio de Quenceio, Alveredo de Sancto Martino," etc. Fragment of Bec cartulary in Archives of the Eure, H. 91, f. 88v, no. 4.

⁸⁰ John of Marmoutier (ed. Halphen and Poupardin), p. 224 (ed. Marchegay, p. 292).

4. 1178/79; Neufchâtel. William Fitz Ralph holds court. Stapleton, p. 57.

5. 1180; Argentan. Agreement "in plena assisa . . . coram iusticiis domini regis". Witnessed by William Fitz Ralph, "qui preerat assise loco domini regis", William de Mara, Richard Giffart, John, count [of Ponthieu], Fulc d'Aunou, Raoul Tessun, and others. MS. Lat. 5424, p. 91; Collection Moreau, LXXXIV. 76.

6. Before 1182; Rouen. Judgment "in assisa apud Rothomagum in curia mea". Valin, p. 271; Round, no. 26; Delisle, no. 408.

7. 1183, January 20; Caen. "In curia domini regis . . . in plenaria assissa" before William Fitz Ralph and many others. Valin, p. 274; Round, no. 432; Delisle, no. 445A.

8. 1183; Caen(?). William Fitz Ralph and many others, none styled justices, but including William de Mara, Hamo Pincerna, Geoffrey Duredent, Jordan de Landa, Richard Fitz Henry, William de Calux, and Roger d'Arri. Delisle, p. 349; Valin, p. 276; Round, no. 437.

9. 1178-1183; Longueville. William Fitz Ralph and many other justices. Valin, p. 273.

10. 1184; S. Wandrille. Grant "in plenaria assisia coram Willelmo filio Radulfi senescallo et iustitia Normannie et multis aliis iusticiis, scilicet Willelmo de Mara, Seherio de Quinceio, Goscelino Rusel". Collection Moreau, LXXXVII. 157 (cf. f. 159), from lost cartulary of Lire; Le Prévost, *Mémoires et Notes pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Eure*, II. 111.

11. 1184; Caen. "Hec finalis concordia facta fuit apud Cadomum in assisia coram Willelmo filio Radulfi senescallo Normannie et pluribus aliis qui tunc ibi aderant inter Robertum abbatem Sancte Marie de Monteborc et Henricum de Tilleio de ecclesia Sancte Marie de Tevilla, unde placitum erat inter eos in curia domini regis. . . . Testibus W. de Mara, Hamone Pincerna, W. de Romara, Radulfo de Haia, Rogero de Arreio, magistro Paridi, Radulfo de Wallamint, Iordano de Landa, Roberto de Curle, W. de Sauceio, Iohanne de Caretot, Willelmo Quarrel et pluribus aliis". Cartulary of Montebourg (MS. Lat. 10087), no. 474.

12. 1185; Caen. William Fitz Ralph and other justices hold assize; the final decision is given at the Exchequer before an important series of witnesses. Valin, p. 277; Round, no. 438.

13. 1186, January 30; Bayeux. Henry, bishop of Bayeux, William de Mara, Archdeacon John d'Éraines, and other justices whose names are not given. Livre Noir, no. 240.

14. 1186; Rouen. Agreement before William Fitz Ralph and Robert d'Harcourt (without title). Collection Moreau, LIX. 106, from the original; Round, no. 140.

15. 1186; Caen. Grant in presence of William Fitz Ralph, William de Mara, William Calviz, Richard Fitz Henry, Geoffrey de Rapendun "tunc baillivus regis", and others. MS. Lat. n. a. 1428, f. 18, from original at Carleton Castle.

16. 1187; Séz. Grant in assize "coram iusticiariis domini Henrici regis, scilicet coram Iohanne archidiacono de Arenis et Willelmo de Mara et aliis pluribus". Livre Blanc of S. Martin of Séz, f. 118v.

17. 1189-1190; Bernai. *Cartulaire de Notre Dame de la Trappe* (ed. Charencey), p. 199; cf. Valin, p. 116, note.

18. 1190, August 10; Argentan. Question of presentation "in curia domini regis. . . . Testibus Iohanne archidiacono Arenensi, Richardo de Argentiis, Willelmo de Obvilla constabulario Falasie, qui prefatam

assisiā tenuerant die festo Sancti Laurentii anno primo peregrinationis Philippi regis Francie et Ricardi regis Anglorum". Cartulary of S. Evroul (MS. Lat. 11055), no. 250.

19. 1190, August; Sééz. Agreement in assize "coram iusticiariis domini regis Iohanne Oximensi archidiacono, Ricardo de Hummez comestabulario, W. de Ovilla, Ricardo de Argentiis". Livre Blanc of S. Martin, f. 134.

20. 1190; Bernai. "Coram Robert de Harecourt et Willelmo de Mara tunc iusticiis, Willelmo Tolomeo clerico, Richardo Sylvano, comite de Alençon, Richard Deri, et pluribus aliis". An assize at Montfort under Henry II. is mentioned. Archives of the Calvados, H. suppl. 486, f. 9.

21. 1190; Caen. Archives of the Calvados, H. 1872; *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XV. 199; Round, no. 461.

22. 1191, October; Caen. William Fitz Ralph, Richard Silvain, Richard d'Argences, Hamo Pincerna, Richard Fitz Henry, Robert, abbot of Fontenay, Roger d'Arri, Gui de Vaac, Turstin of Ducey, Geoffrey the chamberlain, "Lucas pincerna, et alii multi" witness transaction in assize. Archives of the Calvados, H. 1868 (no. 46-18).

23. 1191; Rouen. Valin, p. 279.

24. 1191; Caen. Agreement "in curia domini regis apud Cadomum coram Willelmo filio Radulfi tunc temporis senescalco Normannie et Willelmo de Humetis constabulario domini regis et Roberto Wigorniensi episcopo et Ricardo Selvain et Ricardo de Argentiis, Willelmo Caluz, Ricardo filio Henrici, et pluribus aliis". Roger d'Arri is among the witnesses. Archives of the Calvados, H. 7077.

25. 1192; Rouen. Agreement in presence of William Fitz Ralph, William de Martigny, Richard d'Argences, Durand du Pin, and other justices. Chevreux and Vernier, *Les Archives de Normandie et de la Seine-Inférieure*, no. 35.

26. 1187-1193; Caudebec. Agreement "in plena assisia". Lot, *Études Critiques sur l'Abbaye de S. Wandrille*, p. 179, no. 114.

27. Undated; Caen. Grant in curia before William Fitz Ralph and the king's justices and barons, witnessed by William de Hummet constable, William de Mara, Hamo pincerna, Jordan de Landa, Richard Silvain, Richard d'Argences, and others. Archives of the Manche, H. 212.

28. No date; Bayeux. Grant "coram iustitiariis scilicet Willelmo Tolemeir et Ricardo de Argentiis dictam assisiā tenentibus". Archives of the Manche, H. 309.

29. No date; Bayeux. Grant in assize before William Pesnel, archdeacon of Avranches, William Tolomert, Hamo Pincerna, justices. Répertoire of de Gerville (Collection Mancel at Caen, MS. 296), p. 275, no. 21.

THE FAME OF SIR EDWARD STAFFORD

SOME years ago, the late Martin A. S. Hume, in his edition of the *Spanish State Papers, Elizabeth*, called attention to certain evidence in the correspondence of the Spanish ambassador at Paris which seemed to him to prove that Sir Edward Stafford, English ambassador to France from 1583 to 1587, played false to his sovereign and sold valuable information to the King of Spain at a time when England and Spain were virtually at war.¹ The charge was a grave one, involving as it did the good name of a man who had commonly been regarded as one of the stoutest vindicators of England's honor overseas. But Stafford did not lack a champion. Two years after the charge appeared Professor A. F. Pollard made a detailed examination of Hume's evidence and came to the conclusion that he had not by any means proved his case.² But neither Hume nor his critic went beyond the evidence of the *Spanish State Papers*. Recently, in the light of evidence from other sources, Professor Pollard's opinion has been called in question.³ It seems therefore desirable that the whole matter be investigated afresh and that all available sources of information be exploited with a view to reaching some final conclusion as to Stafford's honesty while ambassador to France.

Sir Edward Stafford's political career and his political and religious opinions were in very large measure determined by his family connections. He was the son of Sir William Stafford and Dorothy Stafford. On his father's side he was closely connected by marriage with Queen Elizabeth herself. His father's first wife was Mary Boleyn, Elizabeth's aunt. This connection, though Sir Edward Stafford was the child of a later marriage, naturally gave him a special claim upon the queen's attention and increased measurably his opportunities for recognition and advancement at court. His mother's lineage was as distinguished as any in England, though its distinction was hardly of a sort to commend it to a Tudor sovereign. Dorothy Stafford was the child of a union between the house of Stafford and the house of Pole, both of which had cherished pretensions to the English throne. Her paternal grandfather, the

¹ *Calendar of Letters and State Papers relating to English Affairs preserved in, or originally belonging to, the Archives of Simancas*, vol. IV., *Elizabeth*, 1587-1603 (London, 1899), *passim*.

² *English Historical Review*, XVI. 572-577 (1901).

³ *Ibid.*, XXVIII. 51, note 69 (1913).

third duke of Buckingham, had lost his head on that score in 1521 and her brother, Sir Thomas Stafford, had lost his, for very much the same reason, in 1557.⁴ The Poles had not been so aggressively disposed to assert their royal claims but had been remarkable for their zeal for the Roman Catholic Church. Cardinal Reginald Pole, of course, had been largely instrumental in the reconciliation of England with Rome under Queen Mary. So Sir Edward Stafford received from his mother an inheritance which, to the eyes of Elizabeth as a Tudor, was bad politically and to her eyes as an Anglican, bad ecclesiastically. It is not unlikely that this tremendous birthright had an adverse effect upon his fortunes, though his mother, as a matter of fact, was one of the queen's favorite ladies-in-waiting and enjoyed a considerable amount of influence at court.⁵ The consciousness that he had some claim to be royal master may account for his restlessness and impatience as royal servant. It does not appear, however, that he ever cast his eyes along the road which had led his great-grandfather and his uncle to destruction.

Sir Edward's second marriage contributed another significant factor to the shaping of his public career. His second wife, Douglas Howard, was the granddaughter of Thomas Howard, the hero of Flodden Field, and the sister of Lord Admiral Howard of Armada fame. She had been married twice already when Stafford espoused her, first to Lord Sheffield, afterwards, secretly, to the Earl of Leicester, the royal favorite. Leicester never acknowledged the marriage and cast Douglas aside later when he found another lady more to his fancy. The Lady Sheffield, as she was generally called, was a woman of vigorous character. She was not unnaturally possessed by a passionate hatred for Leicester and, like almost all the Elizabethan Howards, was secretly inclined towards Roman Catholicism. Her influence on Stafford, whom she married in 1578, was great.⁶ She certainly stimulated, if she did not create, his hostility towards Leicester and was no doubt partly responsible for his leanings towards the Roman Catholic party.

In the year of his marriage Stafford entered Queen Elizabeth's service as special envoy to France in connection with the second Alençon courtship. During the next four years he spent most of his time at that business. In such wise he served his apprenticeship in diplomacy. He also enlarged his acquaintance in France, partic-

⁴ Cf. the lives of Sir Edward and his relatives in the *Dict. of Nat. Biography*.

⁵ She was Mistress of the Robes. There are several interesting references to her in the *Spanish Calendar, Elizabeth*, vols. III. and IV.

⁶ Cf. the lives of Howard, Leicester, and Stafford in the *Dict. of Nat. Biography*.

ularly among Alençon's immediate followers. With Sinier and Marchaumont, Alençon's closest confidants, he was especially intimate. The Archbishop of Glasgow, Mary Stuart's ambassador in France, declared later that Stafford was altogether governed by Marchaumont.⁷ Whether this was true or not, it is clear that Stafford's association with these men was not altogether to his advantage. They encouraged his naturally extravagant habits⁸ and his love of gaming. He admitted later to Burghley that he had lost some six or seven thousand crowns in play with them.⁹

Stafford's connection with the Alençon marriage negotiations brought him into very intimate association with the queen. It also served to define his relations to her principal councillors. The Privy Council divided upon the question of this match. Burghley, Sussex, and the more conservative members favored it. Leicester, Walsingham, and the younger more ardent members opposed it.¹⁰ Since Stafford was an enthusiastic supporter of the marriage from the first,¹¹ he found himself aligned with the conservatives. But his agreement with them was not by any means confined to this particular question. Like Sussex he hated Leicester, and that hatred, aggravated by his marriage to Leicester's cast-off wife, committed him perforce to the party opposed to the favorite. Furthermore, his family connections with the Howards and the Poles naturally inclined him to a conservative, if not to a reactionary, position upon the fundamental question of religion. He was indeed an indifferent Protestant and not at all in sympathy with a policy designed to exploit the resources of England in support of the Protestant faith. Here again he broke sharply with the militant Puritanism of Leicester and his colleagues. Under these circumstances it is not surprising to discover that Stafford, from the very beginning of his public career, enrolled himself under Burghley's banner and professed to be Burghley's man. Since he was a quick-tempered, out-

⁷ Cf. Glasgow to Mary Stuart, January, 1585, in St. P. Mary, Queen of Scots, vol. XV., f. 1 (English Public Record Office).

⁸ Throughout his life he seems to have been almost always in debt. There is a letter in the *Cal. St. P. Foreign, Elizabeth*, 1581-1582, dated April 19, 1582 (p. 631), from Mallart, probably a Parisian jeweller, to Walsingham, asking him to speak to Stafford about a bill for 250 crowns for pearls. Further evidence of Stafford's debts will be found in *Hatfield Calendar*, III. 212 (Hist. MSS. Comm. Rept., *Salisbury*), and in the *Calendar, Spanish, Eliz.*, vols. III. and IV., *passim*. The matter is discussed more at length later.

⁹ St. P. France, vol. XVI., f. 139.

¹⁰ *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXVIII. 34 ff. (1913).

¹¹ His arguments in favor of the match are set forth in *Hatfield Calendar*, II. 239-245. Cf. also *Spanish Calendar*, 1580-1586, *passim*, and *Foreign Calendar*, 1578-1580, *passim*.

spoken person he was almost equally frank in proclaiming his hostility to Leicester and all his tribe. As a natural consequence, he provoked the antagonism of both Leicester and Walsingham. Walsingham in particular never trusted him and since Walsingham, as principal secretary, had charge of the queen's foreign affairs, his distrust had a very profound effect upon Stafford's fortunes as English ambassador to France.

By Stafford's own account, the first intimation of an intention to send him as resident ambassador to the French court came from Walsingham himself. Stafford wrote to Burghley on June 12, 1583:

The matter I crave your Lordship's advice and to use your friendship in is this: Mr. Secretary, the night before we went to Theobald's, called me into the presence window and asked me what mind I had and whether I would be content to go into France, Sir Henry Cobham pressing to come home and the Queen not willing to send Middlemore by reason of his weakness. I answered him that I was born to serve her and so both must and would do, but desired him to provide for me, if he meant to prefer me thereunto, that I might do it with some ability, both for the better credit of her Majesty's service and her own reputation. So he, being called away to come to the Queen, without speaking to me of it, or I to him since of that, till yesterday that he called me in the lobby door and told me he had presented my name to the Queen among some others, telling me that, at the naming of me, and he speaking better of my ability to serve her than I deserve, she confessed I was fit but very poor. He asked me if I liked to have him to press her any further. He would do it if I would. I desired him not by any means and so left. For I have wholly disposed myself to depend of your good counsel and help, to do what you think best and to go as far and to do as much and as little as you think good. . . . Good my lord, do me the favor to give me your advice; first, if you will like of it at all, then how far and how much you like of, assuring your Lordship I will follow your advice and commandment in every point and observe it. If you like not of it, never to speak of it more; if you like of it, then only to depend upon your preferment to her Majesty, which I humbly crave and, if I have it, then I protest to follow the course I have done heretofore in all my negotiations, to depend upon nobody's favor but her Majesty's will and your honorable counsel.¹²

It is obvious from the tone of this letter that Stafford was willing enough to serve as ambassador in France, but was determined not to accept the position at Walsingham's hands. It is equally obvious that he was inviting Burghley to play the patron. In another part of the same letter he confessed that he was miserably poor. He had some six hundred pounds a year through his wife, he said, but he indicated no other source of income. He thought however that his friends would stand security for a loan of "a couple of thousand pounds" and hoped the queen would lend him that much without interest.

¹² Harleian MSS. 6993, f. 44 (British Museum).

Whether his resources were as mean as he made them out to be it is impossible to say. It was customary for Elizabethans, entering the queen's service, to plead poverty, in the hope perhaps of securing an increase of allowance. There is no doubt, however, that both before and after this time, Stafford's finances were in a bad way.

Stafford was finally appointed ambassador to France in September, 1583, and he went over to Paris late in the same month.¹³ Whoever was ultimately responsible for his appointment, it is evident that he began his embassy deeply pledged to Burghley's service and deeply distrustful of, if not openly hostile to, Leicester and Walsingham. The Spanish ambassador in Paris spoke of him later as Burghley's "creature".¹⁴

It is pretty clear that from the first the English Catholic refugees in France and the agents of Mary Stuart as well had hopes of Stafford. His family connections probably led them to believe that he was not altogether out of sympathy with their point of view. Not long after his arrival in France Charles Paget, one of the most notorious of the English refugees in Paris, and the Archbishop of Glasgow, Mary's ambassador at the French court, both came to see him. Stafford for his part declared his intention to exploit them for all they were worth. "I mean to use them all well", he wrote to Walsingham on October 27, "if they come to me For my part I am minded to use the Devil himself well if he could come to me in the likeness of a man to serve the Queen withal."¹⁵ Four days later Stafford wrote to Walsingham again:

I doubt not but I will keep that hand on them here that I will keep credit with them here and yet serve her Majesty truly and well. And if her Majesty do seem to the French ambassador there, or sometimes openly, to stand in some jealousy of my partiality of this part, so it be not so often and openly that he may easily find it, I do not doubt but to serve her turn with that manner of dealing very well, *sub intelligitur*, that her use of her speaking of it commonly do not bring her with use of it to think it inwardly.¹⁶

Stafford's professed intention was to pretend to favor the Roman Catholic cause in order to get information serviceable to the queen. To that end he also entertained the advances of Lord Paget and Charles Arundel who fled to Paris from England late in the autumn of 1583 in consequence of the discovery of the Throgmorton plot.

¹³ His instructions, dated September, 1583, are preserved at the English Public Record Office (St. P. France, X.). On his departure for France, cf. *Hatfield Calendar*, III. 12, and *Span. Cal.*, 1580-1586, p. 500.

¹⁴ *Span. Cal.*, 1587-1603, p. 7.

¹⁵ St. P. France, vol. X., no. 65.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 67.

Leaving aside for the moment the question as to whether Stafford's intentions were honest or not, the immediate consequence of his commerce with the Catholic refugees was to increase his ill-feeling towards Walsingham. Walsingham had written him to keep an eye on Paget and Arundel and had added: "Her Majesty hath willed me to signify to you, that she is assured that the alliance that my Lady, your wife, hath with them, shall not make you to be more remiss to perform your duty towards her."¹⁷ Stafford at once took offense. He sent a copy of Walsingham's letter to Burghley and wrote:

I have sent your Lordship the very words of Mr. Secretary's letter to me . . . and I leave to your Lordship's judgment to judge whether any man that can see any farther than the end of his nose, may not judge or think, that there is an evil meaning in the writer, and to suspect that there is an intention, if it be not already done, to make her [the queen] that it is written from, in her name, to think as evil as they mean.¹⁸

From this time forward Stafford appears to have been convinced of Walsingham's hostile attitude towards him. He complained to Burghley that Walsingham was intercepting his letters, interfering with his secret service, and in general trying to diminish his credit both at home and abroad.¹⁹ He attributed entirely to Walsingham's influence the directions he received from the queen to forbear dealing with the Pagets and Arundel altogether.

I find by proof [he wrote to Burghley on April 6, 1584] that they do what they can to have me have a disgrace. . . . If I had not so bad friends at home as I have and might follow that course that I could best find expedient here without danger of false interpretation, your Lordship should find I would know more of their secrets than I do. But to hazard the peril of evil disposed persons' power to have things misconstrued and to have things well meant evil taken, I had rather than to venture to do well and have no thanks, not to hazard so much and sleep in a whole skin.²⁰

How far Walsingham at this time entertained the suspicions that Stafford attributed to him is hard to say. There is no doubt that from the first he suspected that Stafford's secretary, a man named Lilly, was supplying information to Thomas Morgan, one of

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 94, printed in *Hardwicke Papers*, I. 212. On Lady Stafford's connection with the Catholic refugees in France cf. Stafford to Elizabeth, December 26, 1583, *Hardwicke Papers*, I. 215.

¹⁸ *Hardwicke Papers*, I. 212. Stafford's original draft for this letter is in the British Museum (Cotton MSS., Galba E vi., f. 189b). The version in the *Hardwicke Papers* contains verbal inaccuracies.

¹⁹ Cf. Stafford's letters to Burghley of April 13 and 16 and May 1, 1584, St. P. France, vol. XI., ff. 175, 179, 192.

²⁰ Cotton MSS., Galba E vi., f. 210.

Mary Stuart's most active partizans in Paris.²¹ Stafford himself scoffed at the idea and ascribed it to Walsingham's animosity. Nevertheless, there is evidence to prove that the suspicion was well grounded.²² In the late summer of 1584 Walsingham also discovered, or said he had discovered, that another one of Stafford's servants, Michael Moody by name, was secretly conveying letters from Catholic refugees in France to their friends in England.²³ But the only evidence that Walsingham suspected Stafford himself of treacherous dealings at this time lies in Stafford's own statements to that effect. In view of what follows, it seems not unlikely that Stafford interpreted Walsingham's attitude correctly. There is however no evidence to prove that, up to the end of the year 1584 at any rate, any such suspicions were justifiable.

From the very beginning of 1585, however, the shadows begin to gather about Stafford's integrity. In January of that year the Archbishop of Glasgow wrote to Mary Stuart from Paris that he had gone to see Stafford and that in course of conversation Stafford had told him confidentially that he feared the Earl of Leicester would attempt something against Mary's life. According to Glasgow both Stafford and his wife professed to be Mary's very affectionate servants.²⁴ A few weeks later, Thomas Morgan wrote to Mary on the same subject. Charles Arundel, he said, had urged Stafford to accept a pension and to offer his services to Mary and to the Roman Catholic Church. According to Morgan's report,

²¹ Stafford to Walsingham, October 31, 1583, St. P. France, vol. X., no. 67, and same to same, December 12, 1583, *ibid.*, vol. X., no. 100, and Stafford to Burghley, November 6, 1586, *ibid.*, vol. XVI., f. 139.

²² The Archbishop of Glasgow wrote to Mary Stuart in January, 1585, that Morgan had brought Lilly to him with some information from the English embassy and added that since Mary's treasurer had not paid Lilly's pension, he, Glasgow, meant to advance the sum due. St. P. Mary Queen of Scots, vol. XV., f. 1. This letter makes it clear not only that Lilly was hand-in-glove with Morgan but also that he was a pensioner of Mary Stuart's.

²³ Stafford to Walsingham, January 1584/5, St. P. France, vol. XII., f. 45. There is no direct proof that this charge was just, but Stafford himself found some reason to suspect Moody of base designs (*cf.* Stafford to Burghley, April 13, 1584, in St. P. France, vol. XI., f. 175) and later, while a prisoner in Newgate, he became involved in the so-called Des Trappes plot to murder the queen. *Hatfield Calendar*, III. 233; *Cal. Domestic, Addenda*, 1580-1625, pp. 200-203. These facts tend to confirm Walsingham's estimate of him. In a French account of the Des Trappes plot, Moody is said to have been a prisoner for debt. Teulet, *Relations Politiques de la France et de l'Espagne avec l'Ecosse*, IV. 146. Burghley speaks of Moody in the same connection as "a mischievous, resolute person". *Hatfield Cal.*, III. 224.

²⁴ St. P. Mary Queen of Scots, vol. XV., f. 1. Glasgow bore further testimony to Stafford's friendliness towards Mary in a letter to Mary of March 21, 1586. St. P. Mary Queen of Scots, vol. XVII., no. 31, printed by Labanoff, *Lettres de Marie Stuart*, VII. 175.

Stafford had replied that he would remain faithful to Elizabeth while she lived and would meanwhile do everything in his power to promote good feeling between Elizabeth and Mary.²⁵ Neither of these letters in themselves proves that Stafford was playing the traitor. Both may be interpreted to mean that he was simply pretending to favor Mary's cause in order to gain the confidence of her servants and so to advance Elizabeth's interests.²⁶ But it is evident that he was on intimate terms at this juncture both with the Archbishop of Glasgow and with Charles Arundel. Probably Walsingham became aware of this fact through his secret channels of information. Consequently his distrust of Stafford increased.²⁷

Some time in the late summer of 1585 he sent Thomas Rogers (alias Nicholas Berden), one of his cleverest secret agents, to France to spy upon the English Catholics there.²⁸ It is probable that

²⁵ Murdin, *State Papers*, p. 462. Mary Stuart's letter to Glasgow in reply to his letter referred to (Labanoff, *Lettres de Marie Stuart*, VI. 363) proves that his letter reached her.

²⁶ This was the defense which Stafford himself offered. Glasgow's and Morgan's letters both fell into the hands of the English government when Mary's papers were seized in 1586. On October 2, 1586, Burghley wrote to Stafford: "I must let you know that, upon Interception of letters of *Morgan* and the *Archbishop of Glasgow*, sent from thence to the Scottish Queen, Reports have been made of you to bear some Favour to her." Murdin, p. 570. Stafford, in his reply to Burghley's letter, dated November 6, 1586, wrote: "For these reports that have been made to me of the interception of letters to the *Queen of Scots*, I cannot tell upon what grounds they should come. I wrote, July 18th, 1585, to Mr. Secretary to say that the *Archbishop of Glasgow* and some other, both French and of our nation, had asked me to show favor to the *Queen of Scots*, and had tried to see if I could be made flexible to help to some means to send to the *Queen of Scots*. I could not (to keep them in hand still with some opinion that I might be drawn to pleasure her till such time as I heard back again of her Majesty's will in it) carry myself, as I take it, otherwise nor more discreetly than by my moderate speech of her, tendering rather to the wooing of her than otherwise, leave them to live in hope that by little and little I might be drawn to pleasure her, and having received commandment not to deal in it, if I had, upon a sudden, showed another change in me unto hard terms against her, I must plainly have discovered myself openly, then, to have meant (as I did) cunning with them, under colour that I had thought of the matter and essayed some means which could not be now brought to pass by any means and therefore desired them to be contented and in truth, since, they did never speak to me of it. If upon this they took some heart i' grace and have written hope to the *Queen of Scots*, of me, I know not." St. P. France, vol. XVI., f. 139. The passages in italics are in cipher in the original. The letter which Stafford refers to here of July 18, 1585, is missing. His defense confirms the statement that both Glasgow and Morgan had been making approaches to him.

²⁷ It may be noted in passing that one of Navarre's agents at Paris, the Abbé del Bene, also distrusted Stafford, as appears from his letter to Buzanvals of April 30, 1586. St. P. France, vol. XV., f. 273. Stafford saw this letter and alludes to it in his letter to Burghley of November 6, 1586. St. P. France, vol. XVI., f. 139.

²⁸ A good many of Rogers's letters from Paris are given in the *Cal. St. P.*

Walsingham charged Rogers to have an eye to Stafford as well. At any rate, some time after Rogers returned to England he made a report on Stafford to Francis Mills, one of Walsingham's secretaries. From this report the following extract is quoted:

Sir,

According to your direction I have hereunto set down the matter that concerneth the Lord Ambassador, which matter, being both dishonourable and very perilous, is worthy to be noticed and wisely to be foreseen.

First, by a letter which Thomas Fitzherbert wrote to Geoffrey Foljambe I do find that the Lord Ambassador, in consideration of 6000 crowns and in performance of his promise did show to the Duke of Guise his letters of intelligence out of England.

Secondly, that he imparteth also his said secrets to Charles Arundel. . . .

Thirdly, there was a captain that had served in the Low Countries (whose name I remember not) that passed by Rheims towards Paris, who had a packet of letters from Dr. Gifford and others to Charles Arundel and others at Paris, who presented the said packet to the Lord Ambassador, but he delivered the letters again to him to carry into England and gave secret notice to Fitzherbert and the rest to seek out the party and to procure his letters out of his hands. . . .

And further I find that Arundel can send any man into England by the ambassador's means, which is very necessary to be looked unto; and Arundel did secretly procure letters of commendation on my behalf to his honor for my return into England upon hope that I should or would receive his letters at his return from Spain, which maketh me think that I shall hear from him if he be returned.

Lastly, it was concluded between the ambassador and the rest that the better to increase his credit in England they would deliver him from time to time such intelligence, or the first fruits of the books or libels as should first come forth and be grateful unto him, which was curiously observed by the papists for all common matters, but for other matters, they never troubled his head withal.²⁹

Briefly, Rogers charged Stafford with being on confidential terms with Arundel, with forwarding papists' letters, with providing means for Catholic refugees to despatch letters and messengers to their friends in England, and with revealing valuable secrets to Arundel. The gravest of the charges, however, was that Stafford was being successfully bribed by the Duke of Guise to show him the English despatches.

Domestic, Addenda, 1580-1625, pp. 158 ff. Some information regarding Rogers is given in an article entitled "Mary Queen of Scots and the Babington Plot", by Father J. H. Pollen, in *The Month* for September, 1907. Exactly when Rogers returned to England is not certain. He was certainly in England on July 21, 1586. (There is a paper of this date in his handwriting which was certainly written in England, in *St. P. Domestic, vol. CXCI, no. 23.*)

²⁹ *St. P. France, vol. XVIII, f. 370.* This paper is undated and unsigned. It is in Rogers's handwriting and was probably written in the summer of 1586, shortly after his return from France.

In weighing the value of this testimony against Stafford's integrity, it is necessary to bear in mind that Rogers was a professional spy. The nature of his occupation was not such as to attract honest men. Most of Walsingham's secret agents were disreputable characters and Rogers was no better, although rather cleverer, than his fellows. Indeed, his success as a spy was largely due to the fact that he was a past master in the arts of deceit. Most of the information with which he supplied Walsingham he gained by pretending to be an agent of the Roman Catholics. Under these circumstances it may fairly be urged that he was not above deceiving Walsingham himself. He was no doubt aware that Walsingham suspected Stafford's honesty, he was naturally desirous of cultivating Walsingham's good graces, and he may very well have borne false witness against Stafford upon the supposition that any testimony damaging to the ambassador's character would be welcome to the secretary. So that Rogers's charges in themselves can hardly be taken as conclusive proof of Stafford's treachery.³⁰

But Rogers's testimony does not stand alone. Some time in the early autumn of 1585 Bernardino de Mendoza, the Spanish ambassador at Paris, reported that he had good reason to believe that Stafford might be bribed to furnish information to the King of Spain.³¹ Again, in May, 1586, Mendoza wrote to his master:

Charles Arundel, an English gentleman, to whom your Majesty granted eighty crowns pension a month, in respect of the queen of Scot-

³⁰ There is evidence that Walsingham set another spy upon Stafford in 1587. This spy was none other than the notorious Gilbert Gifford, who returned to France after his betrayal of Mary Stuart and served for a time as a secret agent for England in Paris until he was finally discovered. His correspondence from Paris (unsigned, but easily identified by his curiously immature handwriting) is mostly preserved among the St. P. Domestic in the English Public Record Office. Some of it is adequately calendared in the *Cal. Domestic, Addenda*, 1580-1625. Gifford wrote to Thomas Philipps, Walsingham's secretary, April 26, 1587: "Il nostro vecchio is not now to be depended on . . . neither is the English ambassador in any case to be used for causes well known to you already, which daily increase." St. P. Domestic, vol. CC., no. 49. Again he wrote in July, 1588: "Fitzherbert continueth Arundel's course for Stafford. All the world marvels how he is spared." St. P. Domestic, vol. CCXII., no. 54. Stafford wrote to Burghley January 8, 1587/8: "Within this fortnight, Gilbert Gifford is taken with a queane a bed, and after he was gone, seeking his chamber, letters have been found written to him by Mr. Secretary's commandment, as they write to him to egg him to inquire of me, and he hath confessed that, being heartened to it, he hath written of me, of Lilly my man, of Grimston my man, so many things that both I and mine are in worse predicament than the rankest traitors that are on this side the seas. I have some of the letters, both of the originals out of England and his answers in his own hand. I hope to have more." St. P. France, vol. XVIII., f. 11. Cf. also Stafford's letters to Walsingham of December, 1587, in *Cal. Domestic, Addenda*, 1580-1625, pp. 221-222, 223-230.

³¹ *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1580-1586, pp. 528-529.

land, was constantly in the house of the English ambassador here when he was in Paris, which Muzio [the Duke of Guise] assures me was at his instructions, as the English ambassador was needy, and he, Muzio, had given him 3,000 crowns. In return for this the ambassador gave him certain information through this Charles Arundel.⁸²

Here Mendoza makes precisely the same charge against Stafford that Rogers had made, namely, that he was receiving money from the Duke of Guise in return for information. Since it is hardly possible that Mendoza and Rogers were in collusion in this matter and since Mendoza got his information from Guise himself, there can be little doubt that the gravest charge which Rogers made against Stafford was essentially a just one and that Stafford was, as early as the autumn of 1586, if not earlier, playing the traitor.⁸³

By the end of the year 1586 these facts about Stafford can fairly be said to be well substantiated: first, that Walsingham suspected him of treachery; secondly, that the two most active of Mary Stuart's agents in France, Thomas Morgan and the Archbishop of Glasgow, both believed that Stafford might be serviceable in Mary's cause; thirdly, that Charles Arundel asserted that Stafford could be bribed; fourthly, that one of Walsingham's spies in France directly accused Stafford of selling information to the Duke of Guise; fifthly, that the Duke of Guise himself told the Spanish ambassador in Paris that he had paid money to Stafford and had received information from him. None of these facts absolutely proves that Stafford had treacherous intentions towards his sovereign. He may have been merely posing as a traitor before Arundel and Guise and the rest in order to learn more completely the purposes and plans of Elizabeth's enemies. But there is very little evidence to support this explanation of his conduct and the facts just stated certainly establish a strong presumption against his honesty. It is with them in mind that one should approach the further evidences of his infidelity revealed in the fourth volume of the *Spanish State Papers, Elizabeth*.

On January 24, 1587, Mendoza wrote to Philip II. that the King of Navarre had written to Elizabeth complaining that Stafford was supplying certain information to the Duchess of Guise. Apparently Mendoza heard of this through Charles Arundel, who had it in turn from Stafford himself. Mendoza went on to say:

Charles Arundell tells me that Stafford flew into a terrible rage at this, and swore he would never be satisfied until he had been revenged

⁸² *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1580-1586, p. 575.

⁸³ Later in the same year Mendoza bore testimony again to Stafford's treachery. *Cf. ibid.*, p. 648.

on Bearn [Navarre] and the other too, no matter by what means; and that now was the time for your Majesty to make use of him (Stafford) if you wished any service done. He pressed Arundell to ascertain from your Majesty in what way he might serve you, and you should see by his acts how willing he was to do so. . . . This ambassador is much pressed for money, and even if he had not made such an offer as this, his poverty is reason enough to expect from him any service, if he saw it was to be remunerated.

Mendoza went on to say that just as he was about to sign his letter Charles Arundel brought news from Stafford that a fleet was about to be despatched from England against Portugal.

The ambassador told Arundell to advise your Majesty of this instantly, which, he said, would serve as a sample and hansom of his goodwill; and within a fortnight or three weeks he would report whether the despatch of the fleet was being persisted in, together with the exact number of ships, men, stores and all other details of the project. . . . As it is very important that your Majesty should have prompt advice of such armaments, although the ambassador appears ready enough to give intelligence on that, or any other point in your Majesty's interest, it will nevertheless be advisable to send him 2000 crowns with which to buy a jewel.³⁴

Philip II. replied to this letter on February 27, 1587, as follows:

The new correspondent whom you have obtained to keep you informed on English affairs is very appropriate. You may thank the intermediary from me and urge him to continue in his good service. Give the other one the 2000 crowns, or the jewel you suggest of similar value, although it may be more secret and he may prefer that it should be given in money, through the same intermediary.³⁵

There can be no doubt that the "new correspondent" here referred to is Stafford, and the intermediary Arundel. Nor can there be any doubt that the King of Spain was about to give Stafford 2000 crowns or its equivalent for value received.

In a letter from Mendoza to Philip written about a month later, on March 26, Mendoza referred again to this matter: "The new confidant wishes to have an interview with me, and as soon as a certain person leaves his home I will give him the 2000 crowns which your Majesty has been pleased to grant him. I have also thanked the third party."³⁶

Evidently the "new confidant" refers here to Stafford and the "third party" to Arundel. In view of this letter the statement by Professor Pollard that the hypothesis which identifies Stafford with

³⁴ *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587-1603, pp. 7-8.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XX.—20.

the "new confidant" is contradicted on every page of the *Spanish Calendar* needs some modification to say the least.

Stafford's next appearance in the *Spanish Calendar* in this connection is under the appellation "new friend". Professor Pollard does not believe that this term should be interpreted to mean Stafford, but Mendoza's letter to Philip of April 27, 1587, with its reference to the 2000 crowns already mentioned, furnishes pretty conclusive evidence to the contrary. Mendoza wrote: "Since my last I have seen the new friend who had expressed a desire for an interview. I thanked him from your Majesty for his goodwill, and gave him the 2000 crowns which your Majesty ordered, through the third person who was present."⁸⁷

It is evident that on some occasions, at any rate, the terms "new correspondent", "new confidant", and "new friend", as used in the *Spanish Calendar*, cannot refer to anyone else but Sir Edward Stafford. It is therefore fair to presume that these terms, when they occur in the Spanish despatches at this time, refer to Stafford unless there be positive evidence to the contrary. Professor Pollard has undertaken to prove that these terms cannot possibly stand for Stafford by pointing out that "new friend" and "new confidant" are often spoken of in the despatches in such conjunction with the English ambassador as to establish the fact that they were different persons. For example, he quotes the following passage among several others: "The new confidant informs me that the English ambassador has seen Secretary Pinart."

On the face of it this evidence seems fairly conclusive. But Professor Pollard has not taken account of the fact that Philip and Mendoza were both anxious to prevent their dealings with Stafford from becoming known. Despatches were often intercepted and often deciphered. It may therefore have seemed wise to the king and to his servant to pretend to make two persons out of the "new friend" and the "English ambassador" when they were in reality only one. So when Mendoza reported that the "new confidant" had sent him certain news gathered from Stafford's despatches, absurd as it may seem to Professor Pollard, Mendoza may simply be using this form of circumlocution to conceal the fact that Stafford was supplying news from his own despatches. Since it has already been established that "new confidant" and "new friend" do certainly, at times, stand for Stafford, this hypothesis is at least worth trying.

One of the examples which Professor Pollard quotes is from a letter of Philip to Mendoza of June 20, 1587. Philip wrote: "I

⁸⁷ *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587-1603, pp. 74-75.

note what the new friend told you about the wish of the English to form a closer union with the Christian King, and the active steps that were being taken with that object by the English ambassador."

Here plainly Philip would have us believe that "new friend" and "English ambassador" were two different persons. Further along in the same letter Philip uses the term "new friend" again: "The remark made by the new friend to Believre about my rights to the English crown had better have been left unsaid."³⁸

This comment has reference to a letter from Mendoza of May 20 containing a long account of an interview between Stafford and Believre on the question of the English succession, in the course of which Stafford had asserted Philip's claim to the English throne.³⁹ It is plain therefore that Philip uses the term "new friend" in this connection to apply to Stafford, though earlier in the same letter he has made them out to be two different persons. This is sufficient to prove that the pretended distinction between them was merely a blind devised by the king and his ambassador to conceal Stafford's treachery.

The channel of communication was no sooner established between the "new friend" and the Spaniards than Mendoza began to exploit what he made out to be a new source of information from a correspondent whom he called Julius or Julio. Hume holds that Julio was merely another name for Stafford. Professor Pollard makes strong objection to this interpretation. He points out that the Spanish despatches in the first place represent Julio and Stafford as having been two different persons and, in the second place, make it evident that Julio was sending news from England and so cannot possibly be identified with an English ambassador resident in Paris. It is perfectly clear that the despatches support both of Professor Pollard's contentions. But the question naturally arises whether, in the case of Julio as in the case of the "new friend", the distinction made between Spanish pensioner and English ambassador was not made simply for purposes of concealment and whether the locating of Julio in London was not, after all, merely another device contrived to pull wool over the eyes of English spies.

In regard to the first point, Philip's marginal annotations to Mendoza's allusions to Julio are illuminating. Against one reference to Julio the king writes: "I think Julius must here mean the confidant [*i. e.*, Stafford] as it is to him that Cecil writes."⁴⁰ And again when Mendoza writes: "Julius advises me that the queen of England has

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 133.

written to her ambassador here," Philip remarks: "I think he must be the same man."⁴¹

Whether Philip was right or wrong it is evident from his observations that Mendoza's obvious effort to draw a distinction between Julio and Stafford did not prevent his master from believing, and therefore need not prevent us from believing, that they were the same person.

With regard to the second point that Professor Pollard makes, namely, that Julio was in England, there can be no doubt that Mendoza sought to convey that impression. But he sometimes forgot himself. In September, 1587, he wrote:

Julius has informed me that Drake's voyage is abandoned, as he has been assured by letters from Cecil. These are things that Cecil and Walsingham are in the habit of writing to him. . . . Julius has again been approached on behalf of Épernon with regard to the capture of one of your Majesty's frontier fortresses.⁴²

From this passage it is pretty clear that in September, 1587, at any rate, Julio was in France. Where else would Épernon have been likely to approach him? And why, if he was in England, did Walsingham and Burghley both write him English news? From Mendoza's letter of November 18, 1587, it is clear enough that, at that date also, Julio was not in England: "Julius", he wrote, "has received letters from England", etc., etc.⁴³ Again, on December 27 of the same year, Mendoza wrote: "In order not to lose Julius I will myself run the risk of going to his house at night."⁴⁴ This can mean nothing else than that Julio was living in Paris at the end of the year 1587. Again, in the following July, Mendoza wrote: "I have already paid Julio 500 crowns, and . . . will in a few days hand him the other 500 crowns."⁴⁵ Unless we assume that Mendoza was going to reach the 500 crowns across the Channel, Julio was evidently in Paris still. In a word, if some of the evidence in the *Spanish Calendar* supports the conclusion that Julio was in London, some of it leaves no doubt that Julio was in Paris. It may conceivably be held that this mysterious person was, at different times, on different sides of the Channel, but, if so, it is rather surprising that Mendoza makes no mention whatever of his comings and goings.⁴⁶

⁴¹ *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587-1603, p. 139.

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 133-134.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 162.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 182-183.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 352.

⁴⁶ There appears to be no absolute conflict of dates. Julio, by Mendoza's showing, was in London June 16, 1587, and January 21, February 7, April 20, and July 29, 1588 (*Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587-1603, pp. 118, 198, 213, 278, 366).

Yet, had Mendoza been quite consistent in representing Julio as a correspondent in England, it would still be conceivable that Julio and Stafford were identical. In any case Professor Pollard's assertion that Julio's pretended residence in England disposes of the possibility of his being Stafford can hardly be regarded as conclusive.

Whoever Julio really was, it must be borne in mind that he was supplying to the Spanish ambassador exactly the same sort of information that Stafford, in the guise of the "new friend" and the "new confidant", had supplied. This was so manifestly the case that Philip II. of Spain, when he first heard of Julio, at once jumped to the conclusion that he must be Stafford under a new name. This fact in itself establishes a strong presumption in favor of the identity of the two men, and the presumption is strengthened by the many attributes which they had in common. Julio, whoever he was, was certainly in the employ of the English government in a position of great importance and great trust.⁴⁷ On one occasion he boasted that he could prevent the queen from levying German soldiers to assist the French Huguenots.⁴⁸ Burghley and Walsingham both corresponded with him and revealed to him directly important state secrets;⁴⁹ but he evidently regarded Walsingham as his enemy.⁵⁰ He was also on intimate terms with the Lord Admiral Howard.⁵¹ He was in a position to get very accurate information about the despatches sent to and from the English ambassador at Paris. Finally, he was deep in debt.⁵²

It will be remarked that all of these things are equally true of Stafford. He also was in the employ of the English government in a position of great importance and great trust. He, more than any one else except perhaps a privy councillor, was in a position to influence Elizabeth's policy towards the Huguenots. He corresponded regularly with both Burghley and Walsingham and believed Walsingham to be his enemy. He was the brother-in-law of Lord Admiral Howard. None knew better than he the contents of the French despatches. There is also ample proof of his debts; he himself confessed to Burghley that they were very great.⁵³

and in Paris, November 18, and December 27, 1587, and July 24, 1588 (*ibid.*, pp. 162, 183, 352).

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 310, 320.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 197.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 134, 189, 198, 213, 230, 278.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 149, 173.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 194.

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 176, 190, 310, 320.

⁵³ Stafford to Burghley, November 6, 1586: "For their whisperings that I should be in great debt and that by unmeasurable playing, it is very true that I am in great debt . . . but the cause of it is . . . the manner of living I have lived here, the extreme dearth of the time and the extraordinary charges." St. P. France, vol. XVI., f. 139.

Upon this last point Professor Pollard raises particular objection. Mendoza wrote to Philip II. on one occasion that Julio was in arrears in his account with the queen 15,000 crowns. Professor Pollard declares this "a fact which alone would dispose of the idea that he was an ambassador". Exactly why an ambassador should not be in debt to the queen Professor Pollard does not state. And there is evidence to prove that Stafford was behind in his accounts with the queen. Mendoza wrote to Philip on October 2, 1587:

Julius also informs me that the 12,000 crowns now in the ambassador's hands, out of the 100,000 sent to him by the Queen to give to Béarn [Navarre] and others, are to be employed expressly in aiding the prince of Conti and Count Soissons. But, as the ambassador is overwhelmed with debt, he has spent the money. . . . Julius says that the reason why Walsingham has urged that the ambassador should be ordered to give Soissons these 12,000 crowns is that the Queen should discover that he had spent them, and so he might be disgraced.⁵⁴

Here obviously, if Mendoza was accurately informed, was a situation which might well have placed Stafford several thousand crowns in arrears to the queen. The question at once arises as to whether Mendoza was, or was not, well informed. Upon this particular point, fortunately, there is confirmatory evidence in the English State Papers. On September 12, 1587, Walsingham wrote to Burghley: "Your Lordship, by the enclosed from Mr. Stafford, may perceive how much there remaineth in his hands of the 18,000 crowns which I wish were delivered to the Count of Soissons in case he continue in his former resolution to join with the king of Navarre."⁵⁵

This proves at least that certain money was in Stafford's charge and that Walsingham was urging its delivery to Soissons. It does not, however, prove that Stafford had already spent the money. Upon this point a letter from Stafford to Burghley of March 31, 1588, is more illuminating:

If *Walsingham*, upon that which I writ to him, as I writ to you once, had showed me as much friendship as by others he professed to me, I might come out of this; for, as I writ to your Lordship, I desired him to be a means only that that which remaineth here might not be called upon that I might serve my turn of it till I came home; for I know there are a great many that have deserved, in my conscience, a great deal less than I, have had greater favors. But he writ to me he durst not speak to her Majesty about it and that was all the answer he made me, which was not that which I desired at his hands; for I desired him not to speak to her Majesty of it, knowing what choler any such demands moveth her to, though men do deserve never so well; and if he had been disposed to do me pleasure, without any such demand at her

⁵⁴ *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587-1603, p. 149.

⁵⁵ Harleian MSS. 6994, f. 96.

Majesty's hands, he might have purchased the favor not to have that thought upon, and if I might have that favor I would find means to content everybody.⁵⁶

The wording of this letter is obscure but the meaning of it appears to be that Stafford had requested Walsingham to contrive that the money (probably that destined for Soissons which had never been paid over to him) should not be called for in England until Stafford's return home. Apparently all he wanted Walsingham to do was to keep quiet on the subject so that the queen might forget about the money.

The matter is mentioned once again in the English correspondence in a letter from Walsingham to Stafford, dated December 10, 1588: "Her Majesty spoke to me about the 20,000 crowns and blamed me that I had not taken order with you for its return home. I answered I knew not what need she might have to use them there for some special service, wherewith she was satisfied."

Walsingham added that he wished "some way might be devised to content her Majesty in that matter".⁵⁷

Here, then, is pretty strong evidence that Stafford was misappropriating public funds as Mendoza said he was and conclusive proof that he was behind in his accounts with the queen at least 15,000 crowns. So Professor Pollard is quite unjustified in saying that the fact that Julio was behind in his accounts with the queen disposes of the idea that he was Stafford. Quite the contrary, it tends to confirm that idea.

But Mendoza's correspondence furnishes even more convincing evidence of the identity of the two men. On December 19, 1587, he wrote to his master that in consequence of Arundel's death the "new confidant" had requested him to find some other person of trust to convey intelligence between them and added the sentence, already quoted in another connection: "In order not to lose Julio, I will myself run the risk of going to his house at night until I can find a suitable person."⁵⁸

Here evidently the "new confidant", that is to say Stafford, and Julio were one and the same person. Their identity is further borne out by two of Mendoza's letters to Philip of January, 1588. On the 8th of the month Mendoza wrote:

I was obliged to see the new confidant, and he has again pressed me to lay before your Majesty the necessity in which he finds himself in consequence of his allowances being detained by his enemies. . . . I am

⁵⁶ St. P. France, vol. XVIII., f. 103. Walsingham's name is in cipher.

⁵⁷ Cotton MSS., Galba E vi, f. 394.

⁵⁸ Cal. St. P. Spanish, 1587-1603, pp. 182-183.

putting him off, but if he presses me again about it I have determined to seek the money for him. . . . I have also in view that it is nearly a year ago since your Majesty granted him the 2000 crowns.⁵⁹

The granting of these 2000 crowns by Philip to Stafford has already been alluded to and the identity between Stafford and the "new confidant" in that particular transaction established. On January 9, Mendoza wrote again: "I have decided to do with Julius, as you will see by my despatches, as I think it advisable, so as not to lose him and to keep him in a good humour. It is nearly a year since we gave him the 2000 crowns."⁶⁰

Here the identity of Stafford and Julius is past question. In fact, a careful examination of all the available evidence leaves little or no room for doubt that Julius or Julio and Stafford were one and the same person.

Stafford then, in the various guises of "new friend", "new confidant", Julius and Julio, was evidently supplying the Spanish ambassador in Paris regularly with news of English and French affairs. The question still remains whether the news supplied was of a sort to betray English interests and to make him out a traitor or whether it consisted simply of unimportant matters, disclosed perhaps for the purpose of winning Mendoza's confidence and of securing in return important information which might be serviceable to his mistress. It is conceivable that Stafford may have been posing as a traitor to Mendoza in order to betray Mendoza in turn. This is the explanation of his conduct which Stafford himself was probably prepared to offer and this is the one which Professor Pollard seems disposed to accept.

But the briefest consideration of the information which Stafford regularly supplied to Mendoza effectually disposes of this interpretation of his conduct. Since the midsummer of 1585, Spain and England had been virtually at war. When Stafford began his dealings with Mendoza in the early spring of 1587 Sir Francis Drake was being prepared with the greatest secrecy for his famous expedition to singe King Philip's beard.⁶¹ Almost the first information with which Stafford supplied Mendoza was as to the plans for this expedition and subsequently he kept Mendoza constantly informed of Drake's movements, of the number of his ships, their crews, their armaments, and their probable destination.⁶² Again in the following year, when Elizabeth proposed to despatch Drake to the Spanish

⁵⁹ *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587-1603, pp. 189-190.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 192.

⁶¹ Corbett, *The Spanish War*, pp. xvii-xviii (Navy Records Society).

⁶² *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587-1603, pp. 8, 27, 69, 72, 87.

coast once more, Stafford betrayed the fact to Mendoza.⁶³ When Elizabeth changed her plans and detained Drake, Mendoza knew of that through Stafford also.⁶⁴ When once again, in March, Drake was ordered to take the offensive, Stafford once more made Mendoza aware of it.⁶⁵ And later, in June, 1588, when the Spanish Armada had already made its first start for England, Stafford supplied the Spaniard with precise news of the movements of Howard's and Drake's fleets.⁶⁶ If this was not the rankest sort of treason, nothing is.⁶⁷

Other evidences of Stafford's double-dealing might be cited as well. For example, he betrayed to Mendoza every particular of the efforts of Elizabeth to form an alliance with Henry III. of France against Spain in the spring of 1588.⁶⁸ But enough has already been said to establish the fact of Stafford's treachery. The motives which induced it can only be guessed at. In part they were probably pecuniary ones.⁶⁹ Stafford was deep in debt and needed money. He had misappropriated public funds and the queen was demanding an account of them. His creditors in France and England were both pressing him and apparently his salary was being withheld in England in order to satisfy their demands.⁷⁰ Altogether he appears to have got from Mendoza 2700 crowns, which was little enough for the services performed.⁷¹ How much he got from the Duke of Guise it is impossible to say. Another motive which prompted him was his antagonism to Walsingham and Leicester and their projects. Elizabeth's hostility to Spain and her interest in the Huguenot cause were both largely due to their instigation. Stafford disapproved of both policies and his desire to thwart them was further stimulated by his desire to thwart their promoters. It may be that he regarded

⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 193-194; Corbett, *Drake and the Tudor Navy*, II. 119.

⁶⁴ *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587-1603, pp. 197, 213.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 230; Corbett, *Drake and the Tudor Navy*, II. 129.

⁶⁶ *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587-1603, p. 319.

⁶⁷ On the other hand, Stafford apparently tried to convince the English government, in the spring of 1588, that Philip had abandoned his intention of sending the Armada. Howard wrote to Walsingham on January 24, 1587/8: "I cannot tell what to think of my brother Stafford's advertisement, for if it be true that the King of Spain's forces be dissolved, I would not wish the Queen's Majesty to be at this charges that she is at; but if it be but a device, knowing that a little thing maketh us too careless, then I know not what may come of it." *Defeat of the Span. Armada*, I. 46 (Navy Records Society).

⁶⁸ *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587-1603, pp. 86-88, 149, 173, 197, 214, 223, 261.

⁶⁹ This was the chief motive which Mendoza ascribed to him. *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 176, 189, 310, 320.

⁷¹ This is all that Mendoza indicates that he paid Stafford (*cf. ibid.*, pp. 74, 352, 490). Philip II. evidently authorized Mendoza to pay over 4000 crowns altogether (*ibid.*, 196) but, apparently, it was not all paid.

both the Spanish and the French wars as Walsingham's and Leicester's affairs, not the queen's, and was not altogether conscious of treachery to his sovereign in betraying the plans of his personal enemies. His hatred of Navarre, who had hinted to Elizabeth of his treachery, no doubt furnished him with another motive as well.⁷² Finally, it is not unlikely that Stafford had an eye to his own fortunes in the event of the queen's death. After Mary Stuart's execution he announced his belief that Philip II. had the best title to the English succession.⁷³ Possibly he expected that Elizabeth would not live much longer and that Philip would make good his claims. He told Mendoza on one occasion that if the queen "disappeared" many of the principal people in England would rally to Philip's support.⁷⁴ On another occasion he offered to secure for himself the viceroyalty of Ireland and to hand over the island to Philip when Elizabeth "disappears".⁷⁵ All these look like bids for the favor of a future sovereign. It is worth noticing that after the failure of the Armada his interest in Spain flagged. Mendoza discovered that he was supplying false news and finally, before the close of the year 1588, abandoned hope of getting any more out of him.⁷⁶

How much was known in England about his treachery it is difficult to say. Walsingham knew about it certainly and probably Leicester also. The surprising thing about the whole situation is that in view of Walsingham's knowledge, Stafford was allowed to keep his place. The probable explanation of this fact lies in the character of Walsingham's informants. The testimony of disreputable fellows like Rogers and Gifford could hardly have carried weight against a man of Stafford's birth and connections. Walsingham therefore may have found it advisable not to risk a public exposure. Elizabeth herself revealed no signs of a distrust of Stafford. He returned to England in the spring of 1589⁷⁷ but was sent back to France in the autumn of the same year on a mission to Henry of Navarre. His diplomatic career seems to have terminated upon his return to England late in the year 1590, though he was not supplanted as ambassador to France until the following July. The sentiment at the

⁷² *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587-1603, p. 7.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 430, 468, 477, 501.

⁷⁷ Professor Pollard, in his article on Stafford in the *Dict. of Nat. Biography*, intimates that Stafford remained in France until October, 1589, but it is clear that he left in the spring of that year. He announced his arrival in England to Walsingham in a letter from Dartmouth dated April 8, 1589. *St. P. France*, vol. XIX., f. 103.

English court was probably more favorable to his fortunes at this time than it had been, since his two powerful enemies, Leicester and Walsingham, were both dead. There was some talk of making him Walsingham's successor as principal secretary but the matter fell through and Elizabeth eventually appointed Burghley's son, Sir Robert Cecil, instead. Stafford, indeed, never did occupy any position of significance under the queen after his return from France, a fact which may possibly be interpreted to mean that either she or Burghley distrusted him. At the time of his death, in 1605, there were no apparent smirches on his reputation.

CONYERS READ.

A PORTRAIT OF GENERAL GEORGE GORDON MEADE

THE name of George Gordon Meade will always be a prominent one in American history. Every American knows that Meade commanded at Gettysburg and that if Gettysburg did not end the war, it at least checked Lee and his victorious army in the full march of triumph so decisively that they never again ventured on vigorous offensive action.

Also, the circumstances of Meade's leadership at Gettysburg much increase his claim to admiration and gratitude. To take a beaten army from a beaten commander and at three days' notice win a victory over troops like Lee's under a general like Lee was a task that demanded most distinguished qualities of soldiership. This task was imposed upon Meade against his wish; but he accepted it and showed courage and character and brains thoroughly adequate to the occasion.

Yet he remains one of the secondary figures of the war. Men remember anecdotes and phrases and experiences of Grant and Sherman and Sheridan. Of Meade they know nothing but the name. Though nominally in command of the Army of the Potomac until the end, at the great historic scene of Appomattox he was not even present. As a person he is hazy, obscure, hardly distinguished from the multitude. It is of extreme interest to study the causes of this neglect in the nature of the man; and the delightful material now supplied in abundance by the general's recently published *Life and Letters* makes such a study as easy as it is profitable.

The course of Meade's whole biography is clearly elucidated in this ample chronicle, his faithful effort at West Point, where he was graduated in 1834, at the age of nineteen, his patient labor in his vocation of engineering, his creditable service in the Mexican War, his steady advance in the Army of the Potomac until he reached its leadership, and the eclipse of that leadership under Grant during the last year of the war. Meade's admirable letters, chiefly addressed to his wife, reflect all his daily experience, his triumphs and successes as well as failure and discouragement and disappointment.

The careful examination of these records, in connection with other testimony, shows many qualities that were calculated to lead to success. In the first place there was a sane and healthy desire

for it. It is evident that Meade, like other normal men, longed passionately to get on in the profession he had adopted. "In military matters, as in all things else", he says, "success is the grand criterion by which men are judged."¹ When he feels that he has chosen the wrong path and has missed some golden opportunity, his regret is bitter: "I tremble sometimes when I think what I might have been, and remember what I am, when I reflect on what I might have accomplished if I had devoted all my time and energies to one object, an object where my exertions would have told in my advancement."² On the eve of a great battle he inspires himself with the thought of what victory will bring: "I go into the action to-day as the commander of an army corps. If I survive, my *two* stars are secure, and if I fall, you will have my reputation to live on."³ And he has a clear and sober consciousness of having deserved such promotion as is likely to come to him. "If most faithful attention to those duties for nearly a year preceding, and activity and energy such as (though I say it myself) have attracted attention from various officers, entitle me to the advancement of one grade . . . then I can safely appeal to my brother-officers for my credentials in this case."⁴

And the natural corollary of ambition, sensitiveness at being unduly postponed to others, is by no means wanting. A great clamor was raised before Antietam over Reynolds's removal, which put Meade in Reynolds's place. Meade, thereupon, hotly protested that the urgency to have Reynolds back was a slight to him and that if Reynolds came he should insist on being relieved.⁵ The analysis of Meade's state of mind during the last year of the war, when Grant and Sheridan were crowding him out of public notice, is of extreme interest. Recognizing always, with inherent magnanimity, the fine qualities of both generals, never uttering one word of public protest, he yet shows clearly to his intimate correspondent the keen susceptibility he cannot overcome. "You may look now for the Army of the Potomac putting laurels on the brows of another rather than your husband."⁶ When at last, after the war, the supreme military honor is awarded to Sheridan instead of to himself, his sense of justice revolts in language which shows how deep was the disappointment. "My own sweet love, you can imagine the

¹ *Life*, I. 99.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 40-41.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 311.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 128.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 310.

⁶ *Ibid.*, II. 178.

force of this blow, but . . . we must find consolation in the consciousness . . . that it is the cruelest and meanest act of injustice, and the hope, if there is any sense of wrong or justice in the country, that the man who perpetrated it will some day be made to feel so.”⁷

On the other hand, what is most winning about Meade’s ambition and desire for success is the moderation and perfect candor that temper it. Cheap notoriety, the current advertising of the newspapers, he detests and will make no effort to obtain it or cater to it. Hasty promotion, reward beyond his deserts, he does not desire, rather deprecates it, as bringing later mortification and regret. Even when things seem to be going against him, he recognizes that it is the fortune of war. “I don’t mean to say I have not been badly treated, but I do mean to say I might have been much worse treated, and that my present *status* is not without advantages, and does not justify my being discontented.”⁸ What could be finer than his attitude on the first advent of Grant? “I believe Grant is honest and fair, and I have no doubt he will give me full credit for anything I may do, and if I don’t deserve any, I don’t desire it.”⁹ While no man ever expressed personal ambition more finely than this quiet soldier in the early days of his campaigning, “I hope the people of the country will appreciate what we have done, and for myself individually, if I get the approbation of those in whose hearts I wish to live, it is all that I ask.”¹⁰

Also, Meade had other qualities that make for greatness more substantially than the mere desire to attain it. He had everywhere and always the deepest sense of duty. When there was work to be done, he was ready to do it, no matter how unsavory or distasteful. Grant bears witness to his subordinate’s unfailing earnestness and he adds further that Meade was able to take the plan of another, even when he did not approve of it, and carry it out as zealously as if it were his own. Those who have made some study of the history of the war, North and South, will appreciate how rare a quality this was.

And with the instinct of duty went that of sacrifice. The general would sacrifice private feelings. Even when his child was dying, he would not leave his post. He would sacrifice public advancement. “Sedgwick and Meade”, says Grant, “were men so finely formed that if ordered to resign their general’s commissions and take service as corporals, they would have fallen into the ranks

⁷ *Life*, II. 300.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 234.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 183.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, I. 140.

without a murmur."¹¹ And he goes on to relate how Meade came to him, when he arrived in the East, and offered to give up his position to any other officer that Grant might prefer.

How deeply this instinct of duty and sacrifice was founded in patriotism is understood when we read what Meade has to say about his failure to attack Lee after Gettysburg and again at Mine Run. His military judgment may have been at fault in one or both of these cases, but at least his determination not to be driven from what he thought right by any storm of popular clamor is forever admirable and to be imitated. His own expression of this is so fine that I quote it at length: "It will be proved as clear as the light of day, that an attack was perfectly practicable, and that every one, except myself, in the army, particularly the soldiers, was dying for it, and that I had some mysterious object in view, either in connection with politics, or stock-jobbing, or something else about as foreign to my thoughts, and finally the Administration will be obliged to yield to popular clamor and discard me. For all this I am prepared, fortified as I said before by a clear conscience, and the conviction that I have acted from a high sense of duty, to myself as a soldier, to my men as their general, and to my country and its cause . . . having its vital interests solemnly entrusted to me, which I have no right wantonly to play with and to jeopardize either for my own personal benefit, or to satisfy the demands of popular clamor, or interested politicians."¹²

In addition to these qualities of moral character, which are certainly helpful to greatness, Meade had intelligence of the highest order. His mind was perhaps not so vividly and restlessly active as Sherman's; but it was far more tranquil and far better balanced. It was perfectly capable of sympathy with all sides and with all interests of life. Though his early and constant preoccupation with practical matters left him little time for purely intellectual pursuits, it is evident that he turned to such pursuits by natural instinct. In one of his letters he expresses deep regret at being cut off from the enjoyment of music. In another he shows genuine literary sense by his criticism of the detestable jingle of *Lucile*, then running its brief course of popularity.

In everything relating to the practical affairs of life, the calm lucidity, the broad balance of Meade's intellect make themselves constantly and gratefully felt. When vigor and decision are needed, he is always ready for them. There is no doubt or questioning when doubt and questioning are out of place. Thus, though he dis-

¹¹ J. R. Young, *Around the World with General Grant*, II. 299.

¹² *Life*, II. 158-159.

approved totally of the Mexican War from a political point of view, he felt that, once in, we should prosecute it with all the energy of which the nation was capable. "Let us show a bold and united front, forget *party* for an instant; now that we are in the war, prosecute it with all possible vigor, not in talk but in acts . . . let [Mexico] see we are determined to carry everything before us; and you may rest assured that if she is ever going to make peace, she will do it then, and not till then."¹³ Yet this zeal and efficiency in action are always tempered by a really remarkable power of rising above the immediate present, of seeing things in their larger aspects and their manifold phases, of recognizing the good intention and earnest purpose of an adversary, even when you are opposing him with all your might. No man fought the war with steadier conviction than Meade. But no man showed a larger or more sympathetic tolerance and charity before the war and during it and after it.

So in military matters, what distinguishes Meade above everything else and gives him his lasting claim to respect, is brains. It may be remarked that this was the claim of Von Moltke, also, who is considered to have been something of a general. It was not that Meade had a vivid and fertile imagination, but he saw possibilities, weighed them, and adopted or rejected them on all their merits. He was "not original in devising brilliant plans", says Colonel W. R. Livermore, "but his clear understanding enabled him to discriminate between the plans of others."¹⁴

Of course intelligence, in excess, has its grave military dangers. It is not always well to see all the possibilities too clearly. Meade himself, with that gift we all have of sooner or later defining ourselves, says somewhere, "I am a *juste milieu* man."¹⁵ Now a *juste milieu* man, one who keeps the middle of the travelled road, sometimes balances too well, sometimes errs by excess of caution, sometimes hesitates to take the chances which one blinder or less far-seeing would take in ignorance and come out with dazzling triumph. It was this weakness, if it was a weakness, which induced Meade to provide for the possibility of retreat from Gettysburg and kept him from attacking after the battle, this which prevented him from pursuing Lee with the headlong vigor which the nation thirsted for, this which brought upon him the reproach of Halleck and the pleading of Lincoln. "If General Meade can now attack him [Lee] on a field no more than equal for us", wrote the President, "and will

¹³ *Life*, I. 181.

¹⁴ *Story of the Civil War*, III. 495.

¹⁵ *Life*, I. 162.

do so with all the skill and courage which he, his officers, and men possess, the honor will be his, if he succeeds, and the blame may be mine, if he fails."¹⁶

To this appeal Meade answered, "It has been my intention to attack the enemy, if I can find him on a field no more than equal for us, and that I have only delayed doing so from the difficulty of ascertaining his exact position, and the fear that in endeavoring to do so my communications might be jeopardized."¹⁷ It may be that too keen intelligence in the apprehension of possibilities here did the general an injury, but, I repeat, he at least showed splendid courage in acting on his own judgment alone and not surrendering it to any pressure from others.

Also, there are those who believe that that judgment was usually correct, and who agree with General Hunt as to Gettysburg in particular, "He was right in his orders as to Pipe Creek; right, in his determination under certain circumstances to fall back to it; right, in pushing up to Gettysburg after the battle; right, in remaining there; right, in not attempting to counter-attack at any stage of the battle; right, as to his pursuit of Lee."¹⁸ It may be added that it has never yet been shown and perhaps never can be shown that, if Meade had been supported as Grant was and supplied as Grant was, he would not have accomplished quite as much as Grant.

What is most of all attractive about Meade's intellectual make-up is his absolute candor. There is no bluff, no swagger, no pretension, no attempt to throw dust in the eyes of posterity. He debates and analyzes his own mistakes just as freely and frankly as he would those of another. And when one has read thousands of pages of self-justification by great commanders on both sides, one appreciates how rare such candor is. Take this admirable passage from the official report of the Mine Run campaign, in which the general discusses the arguments for and against his own conduct as calmly and earnestly as if he were pleading in the naked, quiet chamber of his conscience. "It may be said I should not depend on the judgment of others, but it is impossible a commanding general can reconnoiter in person a line of over 7 miles in extent, and act on his own judgment as to the expediency of attacking or not. Again, it may be said that the effort should have been made to test the value of my judgment, or, in other words, that I should encounter what I believed to be certain defeat, so as to prove conclusively that victory was impossible Considering how sacred is the trust of

¹⁶ *Official Records*, series I., vol. 29, pt. II., p. 332.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 333.

¹⁸ Quoted by Walker in *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, III. 412.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XX.—21.

the lives of the brave men under my command, but willing as I am to shed their blood and my own where duty requires, and my judgment dictates that the sacrifice will not be in vain, I cannot be a party to a wanton slaughter of my troops for any mere personal end."¹⁹

With these great moral and intellectual qualities, which should have ensured success and glory, Meade unfortunately combined some others that were less helpful. The latter were not in themselves all positive defects, indeed very much the contrary. Some of them were the most charming elements in the general's character and remind one forcibly of the words of Shakespeare,

"To some kind of men
Their graces serve them but as enemies."

For instance, all through Meade's career we find a singular modesty, almost amounting to self-distrust, and this is a trait so rare in Civil War history, as to attract attention and admiration at once. I have now spent fifteen years in the study of these practical natures who did things, either in war or statesmanship, and I begin positively to thirst for spirits of another type. The achievement of great matters brings out splendid qualities, keen insight, quick decision, the neglect of slight things for what is truly essential. But it also develops and necessarily requires a self-confidence which, repeated in a thousand various phases, becomes intolerably wearisome. The highest order of genius, Lincoln's or Lee's, can do things without this self-assurance; but in greater or less degree it is apt to permeate practical minds of a narrower type.

Now Meade was as modest as Lincoln or Lee, and in his position undue modesty kept him out of the public view and gave others much less deserving a chance to elbow past him in the race for honor.

Not that Meade was without a proper pride and just sense of the value of his ability and achievements. In the midst of later disappointment and discouragement, his heart thrills when he thinks of Gettysburg. Even his enemies, he says, acknowledge that Gettysburg was one of the greatest victories the world has ever seen, though some of them believe it would have been greater if he had not been there. And he frankly declares that, "As I reflect on that eventful period, and all that has elapsed since, I have reason to be satisfied with my course, and cause to be most thankful. The longer this war continues the more will Gettysburg and its results be appreciated."²⁰

¹⁹ *Official Records*, series I., vol. 29, pt. I., p. 18.

²⁰ *Life*, II. 210.

Nor was he inclined to underrate himself as compared with others. He playfully deprecates his wife's enthusiasm, declaring that he is no more than a common soldier doing his duty; yet lest she should take him too closely at his word, he adds with just and manly dignity, "One thing, however, I am willing to admit, and that is, that I consider myself as good as most of my neighbors and without great vanity may say that I believe myself to be better than some who are much higher."

But no man was more ready to admit his own deficiencies. As we have seen above, when he failed he did not waste a moment forging excuses or unloading blame on to others. He went right straight to the causes of failure and if he found them in himself, he said so. When he receives honorable mention, he notes that there is a great deal of accident about it and that many who missed it have done quite as much as he. When he is put forward prominently as the victor of Gettysburg, he points out that chance has its mighty share in all great victories and that he had better abstain from bragging until his future is more secure. And I have met with few commanders on either side who could have penned the simple sentence in which he recounts one of his adventures with Lee. "This was a deep game, and I am free to admit that in the playing of it he has got the advantage of me."²¹

Finest of all, as illustrating this natural instinct of self-distrust, is Meade's shrinking from supreme command. Everywhere one finds men hurt and injured, because not entrusted with positions equal to their merits; but the instances of those who had rank enough and feared more are rare indeed. Meade was certainly one of them. It is not only that he balked when the command of the Army of the Potomac was actually thrust upon him. The boldest might have done that under the circumstances. But months before he writes to his wife in the most intimate frankness of self-confession: "Your anxiety lest I should be placed in command of the army causes me to smile. Still, I must confess when such men as Gibbon say it is talked about, it really does look serious and alarming; yet, when I look back on the good fortune which has thus far attended my career, I cannot believe so sudden a change for the worse can occur as would happen if I were placed in command."²² The absolute sincerity of this cannot be questioned and to turn to it from the loud petulance of so many who are eager to better themselves is like stepping from the clatter of cities into the quiet of green fields.

And as he was too modest to thrust himself into the glare of

²¹ *Ibid.*, II. 154.

²² *Ibid.*, I. 351.

glory, so Meade had another grace inimical to the greatest success of a soldier; he was a lover of peace. It is worth noting that none of the men of the very first rank on either side in the war were of the roaring, swashbuckler type, which prates about the pleasure of fighting in itself. Grant and Thomas, Lee and the two Johnstons, were quiet gentlemen. Sherman was certainly not quiet, but he was anything but a boisterous roarer. And so far Meade is in excellent company. But he differed from all these I have named in that he took little or no pleasure in his profession, in fact found it positively distasteful in all its aspects. "He was not a soldier by instinct",²³ says Colonel W. R. Livermore, and only repeats what Meade was constantly saying himself.

Understand me. I do not for a moment suggest anything so absurd as that Meade was lacking in personal courage. He had probably as high moral control over any physical timidity as a man of such sensitive temperament ever possessed. Splendid anecdotes are told of his coolness in action and by some who were not favorable to him. Read Butterfield's account of his sitting quietly at the crisis of Gettysburg, with the shells bursting all about him, telling stories to the young officers of his early adventures and experiences. "The world might naturally suppose that with the immense responsibility so suddenly placed upon him unsought and unexpected, Meade might have been a trifle nervous or excited. If he was, he never betrayed it."²⁴ Read, again, Horace Porter's description of the general in battle, his sharp, ringing orders, his intense energy of carriage and movement, his quick comprehension of the conduct of all his subordinates and intelligent adjustment of their action to each other.

Yet, if you examine his heart carefully, as it is laid bare in the long process of his correspondence, you will agree with Colonel Livermore that he was not a soldier by instinct. Why, even at the beginning he went to West Point as it were by accident and against his inclination. He had none of the drum-and-fife fever which makes so many boys soldiers before they know it. He was a thinker, a scholar. The drill at the Academy, the endless repetition of technique, indispensable but monotonous, bored him unspeakably. He longed to be out of the army before he was fairly in it. Years later, in Mexico, he enlarges with energetic disgust on the same tedious features of actual military life. "A camp where is no active service is a dull and stupid place, nothing but drill and parades, and your ears are filled all day with drumming and fifeing. All this is very

²³ *Story of the Civil War*, III. 495.

²⁴ Julia Lorrillard Butterfield, *Memorial of General Daniel Butterfield*, p. 128.

pretty for such as have never seen it, but fifteen years of such business takes off the edge of novelty."²⁵

He was delicate in health, too, and the hardships of camp life were a trial to him. He bore them without complaint, but he grew infinitely tired of them. "Do not be frightened about me, but the sight of two gentlemen so sick, with no friendly hand near them, no accommodation of any kind whatever in a flimsy tent, made me feel badly, not only for them, but for myself, in anticipation of being similarly situated. Still, I trust I shall keep well, and if taking care of myself will do it, I am certain of it." He does not seem much exhilarated with the enthusiasm of a soldier's career, does he? And in Mexico, where this was written, in the prime of strength and vigor, he grows so homesick, so stricken with longing for home and the presence of those he loves, that he is only prevented from resigning by the thought that honor will not allow him to do so in the face of approaching conflict.

Honor only, you observe; for all the excitement, all the inspiration, which so many soldiers feel in actual battle, was apparently omitted from Meade's composition. The fighting fury of Jackson and Sheridan and Stuart, the intoxication which even Lee indicated when he said, "It is well that this is so terrible, or else we might grow fond of it",²⁶ seem utterly foreign to this quiet scholar who fought as he did problems in arithmetic. There was little spirit of adventure in the man who wrote, "Before Colonel Cross's death it was usual for the officers to ride in all directions, hunting and for exercise, but I never went more than two miles, always with a party, and always on open ground, where I had a fair view of every thing around me."²⁷ Falkland, whom Meade in some points resembles, could not, in Clarendon's strange phrase, *ingeminate* "Peace! Peace!" with a more thirsty longing than did Meade at an early period in the war. "Peace—oh, what a glorious word, and how sweet and delightful would its realization be to me!"²⁸ And one sentence sums up this whole attitude of mind with conclusive emphasis. "I like fighting as little as any man."²⁹ You will agree, I think, that this is a singular utterance for a great soldier.

Besides these attractive qualities, modesty and the love of peace, which unfitted him for popular military success, Meade had one positive defect, and that was his inability to win men. He had a few

²⁵ *Life*, I. 35.

²⁶ J. W. Jones, *Life and Letters of General Robert E. Lee*, p. 208.

²⁷ *Life*, I. 67.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 317.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 349.

warm friends, he had the esteem of many; but his officers generally did not love him, even when they trusted him, and he had no faculty whatever of inspiring an army with that personal enthusiasm which, while it may not bring victory without great generalship, is almost essential to give great generalship permanent triumph.

This lack of gift for dealing with his subordinates did not come from insufficient judgment or insight. On the contrary, Meade's calm, clear, just intelligence shows in nothing more than in his fine appreciation of the characters of men. This appears admirably, so far back as the Mexican War, in his comments on his fellow-officers. It shows still better, during the Civil War, in all that he writes of the great number of distinguished soldiers with whom he was brought into contact. His judgments of McClellan, of Burnside, of Hooker, remain perhaps the most illuminating of any that we have, not exempt from severity, where severity is required, but absolutely free from jealousy and inclining to emphasize good qualities wherever possible. This recognition of the good is especially noticeable with Sheridan and Grant, whom Meade had certainly no reason to love, but whom he analyzes with the most kindly and generous discrimination.

It is possible that Meade read men too well to be popular with them. The first lesson of practical life is that to be on good terms with people we must treat them as if we thought a little better of them than we really do. Though Meade was thoroughly democratic in principle, it is not certain that he cared very much about being on good terms with the generality. It is certain that he was not one to disguise the truth for the sake of being on good terms with anybody.

Whatever the reason, he had friction with too many. Perhaps his difficulties with Sickles and Butterfield were natural. They were men of an altogether different stamp from him. But he quarrelled with Warren—and made it up, quarrelled with Sheridan, even with the amiable Burnside, and did not make it up. There were others with whom he did not quarrel, but who simply felt that they would much prefer to serve under somebody else. And this is not a favorable state of mind in war. Little things often indicate great defects. I know nothing that better reveals Meade's tactlessness than General Schaff's excellent account of the general's horse. The animal had one of those gaits which are neither a walk nor a trot and make it impossible for others to keep pace with him—a "fox-walk" General Schaff aptly calls it and adds that members of the staff were often heard to say, "Damn that horse of Meade's! I

wish he would either go faster or slower.”³⁰ I fear that Meade rode through life at something of a fox-walk.

Also, it is pretty substantially proved that under extreme stress his nerves would break in abominable fits of temper. We read of the great Condé, that in ordinary converse he was harsh and rough with his subordinates, but that under fire his manners were restrained into an exquisite courtesy. Just the opposite appears to have been the case with Meade. At the mess and the campfire he treated his staff like a cultured gentleman, but in battle, especially if they brought bad news, he rated them as if they were schoolboys, swore, if need be, and in general so comported himself that no one approached him if it could possibly be avoided. “A battle always put him in a fury”, says Grant. “He raged from the beginning to the end. His own staff officers would dread to bring him a report of anything wrong. Meade’s anger would overflow on the heads of his nearest and best friends.”³¹

Meade’s biographers reject evidence of this sort coming from Grant and Grant’s followers—for instance, Dana and Horace Porter—as somewhat suspicious. But there are plenty of other witnesses. General Schaff has no prejudice against Meade; yet he, too, writes: “I have seen him so cross and ugly that no one dared to speak to him,—in fact, at such times his staff and everybody else kept as clear of him as possible.”³²

The most reliable written evidence we have of this weakness of Meade’s is his savage communication to Burnside at the time of the mine disaster. “Do you mean to say your officers and men will not obey your orders to advance? If not, what is the obstacle? I wish to know the truth and desire an immediate answer.”³³ To which Burnside not unnaturally replied: “I have never in any report said anything different from what I conceived to be the truth. Were it not insubordinate I would say that the latter remark of your note was unofficerlike and ungentelemanly.”³⁴ And thus the reply churlish breeds ever the countercheck quarrelsome.

When I read all these things, I turn to Meade’s portrait, and begin to understand it. The high intelligence is under the high forehead. The stern brows and eagle nose mark the unquailing courage. There are lines of sensitiveness, lines of possible sympathy. But it is not the face of a man men love.

³⁰ *The Battle of the Wilderness*, p. 42.

³¹ Young, *Around the World with General Grant*, II. 249.

³² *Battle of the Wilderness*, p. 41.

³³ *Official Records*, series I., vol. 40, p. 142.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 143.

A medical officer came to Meade at some not very fortunate moment and complained that the soldiers were calling him "Old Pills" and he wanted it stopped. Meade clapped on his great eyeglasses, glared furiously at the complainant, and snarled, "Well, what of that? How can I prevent it? Why, I hear that, when I rode out the other day, some of the men called me 'a d—d old goggle-eyed snapping turtle.'"³⁵

A d—d old goggle-eyed snapping turtle! A man had ever so much rather be called the savior of his country, hadn't he? But these soldiers are so keen-sighted and so abominably frank!

The ill-temper, the irritability, however, were only superficial, only the outcome of overwrought nerves stretched to the point of cracking. Everyone recognizes that after such a crisis the general was most eager and cordial in his expression of regret. Moreover, General Schaff adds that "As the campaign progressed, with its frightful carnage and disappointments, his temper grew fiercer";³⁶ and this explains not only any apparent inconsistency in the anecdote of coolness at Gettysburg above narrated, but much besides. It reminds us that Meade was working under difficulties that would have strained a far more phlegmatic disposition. After he had held for months the sole command of that magnificent army, the government became dissatisfied and he was suddenly subjected to the control of Grant, a control kindly exercised, but galling, to say the least. If the head of the Army of the Potomac wished to leave his post for a day, he was obliged humbly to beg permission of his superior. Such outbursts of wrath as he poured upon Sheridan are perhaps inexcusable. They are quite explicable when we consider that Sheridan was so supported by the higher authorities, that he had the impudence to speak to his nominal commander in the following fashion. "I told him that since he insisted on giving the cavalry directions without consulting or even notifying me, he could henceforth command the Cavalry Corps himself—that I would not give it another order."³⁷ For such a reply in any European army the impetuous Irishman would have run considerable risk of being shot.

Through all these immense difficulties, in spite of superficial irritation, Meade bore himself with a fundamental patience and dignity which we cannot fail to admire. Again and again he declares his humble, earnest wish to do his duty and his utter disregard of personal advantage. No finer letter was written during the war than that in which he expresses to Halleck his willingness

³⁵ Horace Porter, *Campaigning with Grant*, p. 248.

³⁶ *Battle of the Wilderness*, p. 40.

³⁷ *Personal Memoirs of General Philip Sheridan*, I. 368.

to be treated as a mere instrument for the welfare of the cause all were desirous to serve. "I take this occasion to say to you, and through you to the President, that I have no pretensions to any superior capacity for the post he has assigned me to; that all I can do is to exert my utmost efforts and do the best I can; but that the moment those who have a right to judge my actions think, or feel satisfied, either that I am wanting or that another would do better, that moment I earnestly desire to be relieved, not on my own account, but on account of the country and the cause."³⁸

So we return to what is attractive about Meade, to what is charming; for however unapproachable he may have been in official relations, no one can read his letters without being drawn to him, without feeling a singular attachment for one so simple, so large-hearted, so sincere. It is very curious that you might study the biography carefully without getting the least intimation of faults of temper, and this seems to indicate that these faults were somewhat less radical than many would have us believe. The only hint of anything of the kind is the sharp scene with a newspaper man, where temper was surely justified, if ever. "I asked his authority; he said it was the talk of the camp. I told him it was a base and wicked lie, and that I would make an example of him, which should not only serve to deter others from committing like offenses, but would give publicity to his lie and the truth."³⁹ And he ordered the offender paraded through the army, with a placard stating that he was a "Libeler of the Press".

On the other hand, there is plenty of evidence that in general social intercourse Meade could be very attractive. His broad and trained intelligence made his conversation full of interest. His manners were easy and courteous. And General Schaff emphasizes the peculiarly sensitive, refined, and sympathetic quality of his voice.

But it is in his family relations that the general's charm is felt most. His letters to his wife have not one atom of sentimentality, but they have unusual tenderness, sympathy, winning warmth of affection. Every detail of his children's growth and education interests him and his longing to be with them is sometimes so great that he is almost ready to forget duty and even honor. "At night, when I thought of seeing you and my dear children . . . I would be almost crazy, and determined the next morning I would go and get my leave."⁴⁰ His respect and esteem for his wife show in the habit of referring every question, even those military, to her sym-

³⁸ *Official Records*, series I., vol. 27, pt. I., p. 109.

³⁹ *Life*, II. 202-203.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, I. 38.

pathy and judgment, and his deep devotion expresses itself often in passages like the following: "Do you know, to-day is our wedding-day and my birthday. Twenty-one years ago we pledged our faith to each other, and I doubt if any other couple live who, with all the ups and downs of life, have had more happiness with each other than you and I."⁴¹

The intimate self-revelation of these domestic letters shows in the writer of them a singular simplicity and single-heartedness, which are quite irresistible. Like many men of great intellectual power, Meade seemed to analyze himself with as perfect frankness as he would have done anyone else. I have already indicated this in regard to military matters, but it is even more attractive as to personal experience. When he is about to be set aside, he notes the fact with entire candor of acceptance. "My time I suppose has passed, and I must now content myself with doing my duty unnoticed."⁴² When a great crisis is at hand, he sets down quietly his own fears and tremors: "Sometimes I have a little sinking at the heart, when I reflect that perhaps I may fail at the grand scratch; but I try to console myself with the belief that I shall probably do as well as most of my neighbors, and that your firm faith must be founded on some reasonable groundwork."⁴³ But the most charming illustration of this personal candor is the general's comment on Reynolds. Few men would let such a remark go beyond their own conscience and many would not be honest enough to admit it even there. "As yet the order has not been issued, but when it comes I shall subside gracefully into a division commander, though frankness compels me to say, I do wish Reynolds had stayed away, and that I could have had a chance to command a corps in action. Perhaps it may yet occur."⁴⁴ And again, in a little different connection, "I envied Reynolds when he left for Harrisburg, and secretly thought the Governor might have applied for me."⁴⁵ Now that I call a ravishing bit of human nature.

The truth is, Meade could afford to be frank, because he had nothing to conceal. Few men have built their lives upon a broader foundation of dignity, of purity, of courage, of faithful devotion to duty. His religious interests are certainly neither obtrusive nor excessive. But they were evidently very deep, very genuine, and very vital in their influence. At times they become almost

⁴¹ *Life*, I. 241.

⁴² *Ibid.*, II. 229.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, I. 219.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 315.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 316.

naïve, as when he inclines to think that his leg was saved by special interposition of the providence of God. But usually there is a grave and solemn earnestness about them which admirably fits the solid, loyal temper of the man. "I thought, too, of how I was preserved then and since in many perilous times through God's mercy and will, and prayed He would continue His gracious protection to me, and in His own good time restore me to you, or if this was not His will, and it was decreed that I was to be summoned, that He would forgive me, for His Son's sake, the infinite number of sins I have all my life been committing."⁴⁶

One bitter sentence, wrung from Meade in the hour of neglect, deserves particular attention. "Don't worry yourself about this; treat it with contempt. It cannot be remedied, and we should be resigned. I don't believe the truth ever will be known, and I have a great contempt for History."⁴⁷ This is contrary to what is usually asserted. Most slighted heroes console themselves with the thought that history will set everything right. Will it?

Without going too much into the general question it may surely be maintained that there is always some cause for a great reputation. When a man is lauded by his contemporaries and by posterity, there is some reason for it. What is puzzling, and what seems to justify Meade, is that the cause is so often inadequate to the result. A man may have splendid gifts, gifts of the highest value to the world, and be known only to few, while one who has a fine figure and a tongue and can drink a cocktail cordially may get laurels and a statue. It was something so with Meade. He had a dozen great qualities. But because he had not the faculty of drawing men after him, he must stand not only behind those who had that faculty with others, as Lee and Sherman and Sheridan and Thomas, but even behind those who had that faculty and little else, as Hooker and McClellan.

He was simply the man who fought Gettysburg. After all, History takes note of that.

GAMALIEL BRADFORD.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 276-277.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, II. 271.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

[Under this caption it is proposed to print in each number of the REVIEW, hereafter, three or four or five brief contributions in which historical investigators may communicate new discoveries, new criticism of sources, new arguments, new conclusions, or suggestions for further research or thought. It is hoped that the addition, to the "body articles", of this new department or group of briefer communications—peltasts reinforcing the conventional hoplites of research, corvettes supporting the traditional three-deckers—may make the general array more mobile and effective, and may encourage in the historical profession a free and intimate interchange of results and opinions. But it is also hoped that all who favor us with such notes will compose them with great brevity.]

CONCILIIUM AND CONSILIUM.

IN the July number of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW a question was raised by Professor A. B. White, in his article on "Concentration of Representatives" and again in his review of *The King's Council*, which it seems to me should not pass without an answer. This is in regard to the terms *concilium* and *consilium*, as used in the thirteenth century, and the ideas suggested by them. It is maintained that "*Consilium* was, in addition to its old meaning of counsel, from the beginning of Henry III.'s reign, used regularly for the smaller assembly, the ancestor of the Privy Council, whereas in nearly every case in which a large assembly of barons was referred to, whether in chronicle or official record, *concilium* was used" (AM. HIST. REV., XIX. 740; also 868). I readily acknowledge the omission of *The King's Council* to treat this point specifically, although the omission was not from ignorance. To present some of the facts in evidence, it is true that in the language of the Church the form *concilium* was as a rule preferred to designate all ecclesiastic assemblies of formal character, whether these were general or local, oecumenical, plenary, provincial, or regional; while *consilium* in addition to its sense of counsel or advice was used in the documents of the Church for secular councils of state and town (see Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum*; Wilkins, *Concilia*; and Du Cange, *Glossarium*). To a noticeable extent the writers of England, in both chronicles and records, were affected by this example and sought to make similar distinctions between councils of state, although the institutions were by no means parallel. Matthew Paris and others refer to the great assemblages summoned by the king in phrases such as *gen-*

erale concilium and *concilium congregatum*; sometimes indeed they bring the two forms into contrast as *per consilium et assensum concilii nostri*. But they give also so many instances clearly to the contrary, to say nothing of expressions of double or ambiguous meaning, that we may reasonably hesitate to accept the statement of a positive rule in this regard. The following examples show that *consilium* was used, interchangeably with *concilium*, to denote the council in its larger and more dignified form, and by some writers was the term preferred. In the authoritative edition of Bracton's *Note Book* I find *generale concilium* given only once; elsewhere it is always *consilium*, even when the council was manifestly great, as when at Merton in 1234-1235 the barons pronounced their *nolumus* against change in the laws of England—*convocato consilio provisum est* (Maitland, no. 1117, etc.). As early as the expression "council in parliament" becomes a current phrase, denoting the king's council in its most expanded form, it appears regularly as *consilium*, not *concilium*, in *parlamento* (*Rot. Parl.*, I. 15, 125, 150, etc.). The interchangeability of the two forms of the word is shown in the following passage referring to the ecclesiastical council of Lyons in 1274, *de consilio Lugdunensi . . . fuit concilium maximum celebratum* (*Flores Hist.*, III. 33). At the same time with less frequency *concilium* instead of *consilium* was used in the sense of counsel as well as for council in its less formal aspect. More than once Matthew Paris gives the word a double meaning, as for instance, *significarunt cardinales inito prolixiori concilio . . . ut convocaretur concilium generale* (IV. 30, also 372). In the records of the Exchequer we find *concilium ad scaccarium* as well as *consilium ad scaccarium* (*King's Council*, p. 41. In the rolls of the *curia regis* there are upon the same membrane *Placita coram Consilio Domini Regis* and *Placita coram W. Ebor' Archiepiscopo et Concilio Domini Regis* (*Abb. Plac.*, p. 118; a reference which I have verified from the roll). Other passages of the kind are *coram ipso domino rege et concilio suo* (*Ann. Burton*, p. 253), *a regali concilio* (*Dunst.*, p. 68), *rege et concilio suo ignorantibus* (*ibid.*, p. 221, also 274).

If it be thought that these are only exceptions which prove the rule, there is still a stronger side of the argument. For if the distinction of *concilium* and *consilium* had been well grounded in the thirteenth century, we should expect the same usage to be carried forward into the fourteenth century, when the existence of two institutions, namely Parliament and the council, was clearly recognized. But instead in all the official records of the latter time the spelling *consilium* gains ground almost to the exclusion of the other. The

Parliament itself, or rather the inchoate House of Lords, among other modes of designation continues to be known as *consilium in parlamento* (*Rot. Parl.*, *passim*; *Ancient Petitions*, etc.). A statute is sanctioned *de consilio praelatorum, comitum et aliorum fidelium regni nostri de consilio nostro existentium* (*Statutes of the Realm*, I. 51). Writs for the summons of barons and knights are issued *de militibus eligendis et mittendis ad consilium, de consilio summoni-endo*, etc. (*Parl. Writs*, I. 26, 65). The expression *commune consilium*, which has been cited as suggesting only the process of taking counsel, is shown to mean council as well as counsel in the passage *Rex . . . in pleno parlamento suo et de communi consilio suo statuit* (*Rot. Parl.*, I. 78); later there is *clericus communis consilii* (*King's Council*, p. 368). On the other hand *concilium* survives in the connection *de concilio Regis iuratus, secretum, concilium*, etc. (*ibid.*, pp. 74, 88, 105). The later records of the council itself, whenever they are in Latin and also when at length English words like "counsellor" and "councillor" appear, fail to bear out the assumption that there was any philological difference between *consilium* and *concilium*, much less that *magnum consilium* of the fourteenth century was an evolution apart from *magnum concilium* of the thirteenth century. When the entire history of the council is held in view, the evidence seems obvious and overwhelming that instead of two words connoting two ideas, which have been taken as forecasting two institutions, we have only variants of the same word employed diversely, it is true, at certain times by individual clerks. One reason why the letter *s* so far superseded the *c* is found in the tendencies of the vertical style of handwriting, which multiplied the upright letters and the upright forms of letters rather than the round letters. It may be noticed incidentally that the round *s* (like a Greek sigma) is not always perfectly distinguished from the *c*, but the Gothic style ran more and more exclusively to the upright *s* (like an *f*).

Finally there is a reason why the clerks of the thirteenth century were unable to separate the two ideas with any degree of clearness. This was because the king's council itself was not as yet defined in respect of its larger form apart from its smaller form. Only for purposes of taxation, according to *Magna Carta*, art. 14, was it stated that all the barons should be summoned and how they should be summoned. Since the levy of a tax therefore was properly by authority of a general council, it is pertinent to the argument to notice that in regard to the carucage of 1217 it was said *assisum fuit per consilium regni nostri* (*Rot. Lit. Claus.*, I. 348). For other functions there was no standard of size, how large the council should be,

or as to formality, in what manner it should be assembled. Often it was small, but from its narrowest circle it expanded to its widest through every degree of dimensions. Nor can we be sure, as Mr. White says further, "that a council in connection with which a date was named, indicating limited duration, the temporary presence of many magnates, was *concilium*; advice, deliberation, or the counseling body that was in continuous session, the thing made up of the king's *consilarii*, was *consilium*". So far as evidence is given it appears that a small council or a select number of lords might be summoned by writ (*Cal. Close Rolls*, 12 Edw. III., p. 517). Moreover whenever trials were held, in order to secure the attendance of all participants, in the nature of things it was necessary to appoint a day. It is likely that the instance cited (*AM. HIST. REV.*, XIX. 741, note) of a council, *i. e.*, *concilium*, three weeks after Michaelmas refers to a conciliar session such as was frequently held either in conjunction with or immediately after the fall session of the Exchequer. In this case as well as other cases that are mentioned in the same foot-note there is nothing either in the words or the context to indicate whether the council at the moment was great or small, nor could anyone say at what point a small council became great. This argument it would be unnecessary to give so fully, were it not a common fallacy to define institutions too closely by their names, and to press names and phrases into a meaning beyond their contemporary sense. As Maitland has said, "There is for us a besetting sin of antedating modern ideas."

JAMES F. BALDWIN.

KENTUCKY RESOLUTIONS OF 1798

IN 1821 Mr. Jefferson wrote to J. Cabell Breckinridge recounting his recollection of the genesis of the Kentucky Resolutions. In this letter, he gives the impression that a consultation had taken place between John Breckinridge, father of the person to whom the letter was written, Wilson Cary Nicholas, one of Jefferson's two most trusted lieutenants, and himself. He thought the determination to protest against the Alien and Sedition Laws proceeded somehow from that conclave. "Those gentlemen", Jefferson wrote, "pressed me strongly to sketch resolutions for that purpose, your father undertaking to introduce them to that [the Kentucky] legislature, with a solemn assurance, which I strictly required, that it should not be known from what quarter they came. I drew and delivered them to him." Later on, in this same letter, Jefferson asserts that his

memory is not distinct as to the part played by the elder Breckinridge in this conference; but considering his age, and the twenty-three years that had elapsed since 1798, his recollection was far better than that of most old men and far better than his own as to some other events of his earlier career. Upon this letter and others contained in the Breckinridge Papers there was slowly built up a theory of the intimate connection of the Kentucky statesman with the genesis of the Resolutions of 1798. This view is set forth in great detail by Colonel Reuben T. Durrett, of Louisville, Kentucky, in *The Southern Bivouac* for March, April, and May, 1886. A year later Jefferson's great-granddaughter, Sarah Nicholas Randolph, who was also descended from W. C. Nicholas, printed an article in *The Nation* (May 5, 1887) examining the evidence brought forward by Colonel Durrett. Her argument centred around a letter from Jefferson to Nicholas, dated "Monticello, October 5, 1798". This letter is as follows, from the text printed in Paul Leicester Ford's edition of the *Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, which is taken from the Jefferson Manuscripts in the Library of Congress:

TO WILSON CARY NICHOLAS

MONTICELLO Oct 5. 98.

Dr. Sir,—I entirely approve of the confidence you have reposed in mr Brackenridge, as he possesses mine entirely. I had imagined it better those resolutions should have originated with N. Carolina. But perhaps the late changes in their representation may indicate some doubt whether they could have passed. In that case it is better they should come from Kentucky. I understand you intend soon to go as far as mr Madison's. You know of course I have no secrets for him. I wish him therefore to be consulted as to these resolutions. The post boy waiting at the door obliges me to finish here with assurances of the esteem of Dr Sir your friend and servt.

President Ethelbert D. Warfield of Lafayette College was then putting the finishing touches on his book, entitled *The Kentucky Resolutions of 1798: an Historical Study* (New York, 1887), which was published in the following autumn. He at once sat down and wrote a reply to Miss Randolph's article and this was published in *The Nation* for June 2, 1887. Warfield upheld the Breckinridge side of the debate, which he was then well able to do, as he had the Breckinridge Papers then in his possession. He declared it was almost impossible to credit Breckinridge's failure to see Jefferson in the weeks before the above letter was written, which evidently had thrown a good deal of doubt on the Jefferson-Nicholas-Breckinridge conference, as set forth in Jefferson's letter of 1821.

The probabilities were entirely in favor of a conference having

been held, for Jefferson was in the habit of inviting his henchmen to pass week-ends or holidays inconspicuously at Monticello. He took a good deal of pains sometimes to obliterate all traces of these meetings and the fact that no evidence of such a conference is to be found in any contemporary writings does not prove anything whatever, one way or the other. About nine months after the date of the above letter, for example, Jefferson invited Madison to come to his house for a conference with Nicholas. Mrs. Madison carried the letter containing this invitation from Monticello to Montpelier; but in the last sentence Jefferson cautioned Madison that his wife knew nothing as to the object of the meeting. In a similar way, Jefferson was sometimes very eager to have all epistolary evidences destroyed, or, at any rate, to have them concealed during his lifetime. In other cases he was extremely careful to preserve copies of letters that he seemed to regard in the nature of vouchers for his good faith or political honesty. To accomplish this, he had two polygraphs constructed and also possessed at least one press for taking copies of his letters by the wet process. As to his other practice, the following letter to W. A. Burwell is to the point. In this he enclosed the draft of a paper and reminded his correspondent that he had promised to copy it himself, "and not to let it be seen by any one in the original: nor is the least idea to be permitted to escape as to the quarter from which it comes". Other letters Jefferson did not sign, and in some cases he commanded his correspondent to "burn this letter". In the case of the letter to Nicholas of October 5, which he evidently wished to have preserved, the copy in the Jefferson Manuscripts at Washington bears the endorsement:—"See his letter of Oct. 4. 98. to which this is an answer. Copy of a letter time not permitting a press copy this was immediately written from recollection and is nearly verbal." It appears from this, therefore, that the only copy we have of this particular letter is not the original, not a polygraph duplicate, not even a press copy, but is merely Jefferson's recollection of what he had written. It might easily be argued, therefore, that this letter was no better evidence than that of 1821.

In addition to these difficulties, Jefferson's papers have suffered vicissitudes. They have been moved about, have been divided into two groups, one relating to his public life, and the other to his private relations. This division was made by his descendants and does not always closely follow any line of demarcation. In addition, some of the public papers somehow got separated from the rest and are even now rather apart from the general collection in the Library of

Congress as described in the published calendar. Among these is a letter from Wilson Cary Nicholas to Jefferson, dated October 4, 1798, which is plainly the letter referred to in the endorsement of Jefferson's letter of October 5. Nicholas writes that he has put into

the hands of Mr. John Breckinridge a copy of the resolutions that you sent me, he says he is confident that the legislature of Kentucky (of which he is a member) will adopt them. . . . he was very anxious to pay his respects to you but we both thought it best that he should not see you, as we believed if he did the resolutions would be attributed to you. I ventured to inform him that they came from you.

There is no reason to doubt the authenticity of this letter. It appears clearly from it that Breckinridge did not go to Monticello on this visit to his old home near Charlottesville; that he had no part whatever in the inception of the protest against the Alien and Sedition Laws and that their passage by a Kentucky assembly was rather a matter of accident than of design. Colonel Durrett seems to have shown without chance for debate that there was considerable revision of the Resolutions after they left Jefferson's pen, and before their introduction into the Kentucky legislature; but as to who made these changes and the reasons for their being made, that is an entirely different matter.

EDWARD CHANNING.

SLAVE CRIME IN VIRGINIA

To promote the suppression of crime, various colonies and states provided by law that the owners of slaves capitally sentenced should be compensated by the public at appraised valuations. This brought it about that, although slaves were generally tried by courts not of record, in many cases documents reciting the convictions were officially filed. In Virginia the reimbursement was made through the state treasury. Accordingly it happens that in the great mass of archives recently made accessible in the Virginia State Library sundry packages contain some thirteen hundred vouchers, each recording the conviction of one or more slaves for a capital crime. So far as my knowledge goes, no comparable record has come to light in another commonwealth.

The earliest voucher is dated 1774; but the six which fall in that decade are so few as to indicate that the file is imperfect.¹ In

¹ [Among notes which the managing editor of this journal made in 1891 from the miscellaneous papers of the legislative session of 1774, then recently dis-

the seventeen-eighties the vouchers list 66 convictions; in the nineties, 112; and in the first five decades of the nineteenth century, 179, 185, 242, 210, and 168, respectively. All vouchers for the years 1856, 1857, and 1858, and apparently some of those for 1859, are missing. In those preserved for the rest of the fifties there are 168 convictions recorded, and 26 in 1860, 28 in 1861, 15 in 1862, 6 in 1863, and 7 in 1864, when the series ends. The total number of convictions from first to last, thus recorded, was 1418; and all but 91 of those convicted were males.

In 301 cases the crime is reported merely as a felony, or else without any specification at all. Of the 1117 offenses definitely stated, 346 were murder, discriminated as follows: murder of master, 56; of overseer, 7; of other white man, 98; of mistress, 11; of other white woman, 13; of master's child, 2; of other white child, 7; of free negro man, 7; of slave man, 59; of slave woman, 14; of slave child, 12 (all of which were murders by slave women of their own children); of persons not described, 60. Of the murderers 307 were men and 39 were women.

For rape there were 73 convictions, and for attempts at rape, 32. This total of 105 cases was quite evenly distributed by years in proportion to capital crime in general; but in the territorial distribution there was a marked preponderance in the newer counties of the Piedmont and the Shenandoah Valley, as compared with the older district of the Tidewater where there were but 21 convictions all told. In two cases at least the victims were white children, one described as an infant, the other as under ten years old. In two more instances they were free mulatto women, though in one of these the conviction was merely of "suspicion of rape". That a voucher should have recorded sentence on suspicion and that the prisoner should actually have been transported under it shows not only an extreme amateurishness of the court but a surprising acquiescence by the governor. None of the vouchers tell of the rape of slave women; but this is far from proving that such were immune. The whole record, which might easily be supplemented with cases from other states, refutes the oft-made assertion that white women were never assaulted by negroes in the ante-bellum South.

Convictions for poisoning and attempts to poison, including the administering of ground glass, numbered 55 (40 men and 15 women), in most of which the crime was directed against white covered and not yet arranged, he finds succinct mention of twenty-two slaves condemned to be hanged—one in 1770, nine in 1772, eleven in 1773, one in 1774—with an average valuation of £76, but without specification as to crimes. See also *Journals of the House of Burgesses, 1773-1776*, p. 11 (March 5, 1773).]

persons. Associated with this category was the conviction of a man in 1794 and a woman in 1823 for administering medicine to white persons—a capital offense under the law. The sentence in the former case is not recorded. In the latter the court recommended the prisoner to the governor's mercy, and her sentence of death was commuted to transportation. If other arrests were made under this precautionary law the prisoners were doubtless either acquitted or pardoned.

For other assaults, attempts to murder, and the like, there were 111 sentences falling within the purview of the vouchers, only two of which were described as being directed against negro victims. Sentences to corporal punishment do not appear in the vouchers except by chance. One of these, in 1854, was for abetting an attempt at murder. The sentence imposed was thirty-nine lashes on the first day, fifteen on the second, fifteen on the third, fifteen on the fourth, and thirty-nine on the fifth. Doubtless the prisoner would have greatly preferred the sentence of transportation which was given his principal in the crime.

For insurrection and conspiracies to that end 91 slaves were convicted, including 36 in Henrico County in 1800 for participation in Gabriel's uprising, and 17 in 1831, mostly in Southampton County, as followers of Nat Turner. The rest were scattering. Fourteen convictions occurred, indeed, in 1802, but they were distributed in three isolated counties.

For arson there were 90 slaves convicted, including 29 women. For burglary there were 257, with but one woman among them. The highway robbers numbered 15; the horse thieves 20; and those sentenced for other sorts of theft 24, with no women in these categories. Strikingly unusual convictions were those of a slave in 1827 for forgery, and of another in 1839 for causing to be printed certain writings denying the right of masters to property in their slaves.

The only unusual punishment recorded in the vouchers was that of a slave in Rockridge County, 1786, who for the murder of a fellow slave had his head cut off and stuck on a pole at the forks of the road. The least of the offenses of which details are given was that of entering a kitchen and stealing one silver spoon, in Nottoway County, 1789, for which the thief was put to death. The laws and their administration were more severe in the eighteenth century than afterward.

Occasionally the vouchers furnish more or less unexpected sidelights. In 1788 a citizen of Amelia County was paid £80 for a slave who had been killed after proclamation as an outlaw. In

1801 Tom and Pharaoh were bought for \$500 each and emancipated by the state in reward for public services, presumably in connection with the repression of Gabriel's insurrection. In 1805 a slave who two years before had been sentenced to transportation in punishment for burglary reappeared and was executed, and his master was then given compensation. The inference is that the master had been allowed to deport the slave privately. Several other vouchers indicate similar irregularities. A few vouchers note that the slaves convicted belonged to free persons of color, and in one case that the slave, along with other property, had been given to a free negro girl by the last will of a white man. One of the negroes convicted, furthermore, was described as a slave for a term of years. Several of the convicts broke jail after sentence, but their masters were paid for them notwithstanding.

The court, the commonwealth's attorney, and private citizens occasionally asked the governor to pardon a slave. Where pardon was granted the case does not appear in the vouchers; but where the sentence was commuted to deportation or imprisonment the vouchers give the facts. A peculiar ground for petitioning is given in the following which is drawn from a source outside the vouchers: "A young negro, a valuable tradesman in this town, is condemned to die on the tenth of next month. His master employed no attorney, and it is the general opinion he has a much greater regard for the high value set upon his negro than for life. From our long friendship I petition you to pardon him."²

Many of the vouchers in the eighteenth century omitted mention of the sentences imposed; but nearly all the rest recorded sentences of death. In the nineteenth century, on the other hand, nearly two-thirds of the sentences prior to the gap in the file after the middle of the fifties imposed transportation, either in the first instance or upon commutation by the governor, while the rest were to death, except for a few scattering commutations to imprisonment. From 1859 to 1863 most sentences were commuted to labor upon the public works; but in 1864, although the blockade then made exports from the Confederacy virtually impossible, there was a curious reversion to sentences of deportation.

From the fact that the domestic slave-trade had carried many thousands of slaves from the Virginia Tidewater it might be surmised that, through the sale of the refractory, disorder would there


² Letter of William Ramsay, Alexandria, Va., June 20, 1792, to the governor of Virginia. *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, V. 600. Another petition with many signatures supported this, and the sentence was commuted to transportation. *Ibid.*, pp. 617, 624.

have been reduced below the normal. While in regard to rape this is borne out by the record, the ratio of slave crime in general runs squarely counter. As a rule the convictions were nowhere so numerous in proportion to the slave population as in the Tidewater and the closely adjacent portions of the Piedmont. To explain this there comes to mind the ante-bellum belief that the presence of free negroes tended to make the slaves disorderly; and in fact an excess in the ratio of the free negro population to that of the slaves existed in most of the counties where slave crime was excessive.

The rates of compensation to the masters of the condemned slaves of course varied widely. The subjoined chart will show the fluctuations from year to year in the average appraisals of those who may be reckoned to have been prime field hands. From \$800 in 1861, these valuations rose to \$900 in 1862, \$3000 in 1863, and \$4000 in 1864 in Confederate money. But that is merely to say that Confederate paper depreciated still more swiftly than did slave property.

ULRICH B. PHILLIPS.

Average Valuations of Prime Field Hands convicted of Capital Crime in Virginia, 1782-1861.



DOCUMENTS

Letters from Lafayette to Luzerne, 1780-1782

PART I.

THE letters from Lafayette to the Chevalier de la Luzerne, the French minister to the United States, that are here printed were found in the archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Paris, by Mr. Leland, during his investigations on behalf of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. That they should have remained unknown until the present time, not having been seen even by Doniol, is due to the fact that they are in that part of the sub-series *États-Unis, Supplément*, that has only recently been made accessible. This part is composed of the archives of the French Legation in the United States, which were sent to Paris some time during the first half of the nineteenth century. The volumes constituting them contain, not only the letters from Lafayette, but a great number of letters from various French officers who served in the American Revolution. With one or two exceptions, noted below as they occur, Lafayette's letters are in his own hand, his secretary having returned to Paris (see no. VIII.); consequently the originals, remaining in the archives of the legation, are unique. Of the letters composing the group, only one has previously been printed: that is the letter of September 26, 1780, recounting the discovery of Arnold's treason, which is to be found in the *Mémoires* of Lafayette, and in Charlemagne Tower's *Lafayette in the American Revolution*. It is to be noted that this letter is not in Lafayette's hand, and doubtless a copy of it was retained among his papers. With the exception of this letter, all the letters found are here printed. They constitute an interesting contribution to the history of Lafayette's participation in the establishment of American independence.

The historical setting of Lafayette's second period in America, 1780-1781, is too well known to require elaboration here. It will be remembered that he had returned to France upon leave of absence early in 1779; that he was instrumental in securing military aid; and that in April, 1780, he returned to America to announce the coming of Rochambeau's army and of de Ternay's fleet, and to resume his duties as major-general in the Continental Army. Arriving in Boston on the *Hermione* on April 28, he reached Washington's head-

quarters, at Morristown, on May 10, and very shortly proceeded to Philadelphia, where he conferred with members of Congress and especially with the Chevalier de la Luzerne, who had arrived in America in September, 1779, to succeed Gerard as minister plenipotentiary.

The correspondence with Luzerne, which commenced in May and continued through 1781, deals largely with military affairs. The first few letters relate mainly to the preparations to be made for the arrival of Rochambeau's army; then follow letters discussing the general problem of the campaign of the combined armies, Lafayette being desirous of undertaking an operation against New York; after these are letters relating to military movements, culminating in the Virginia campaign of 1781 and the surrender of Cornwallis.

In printing the texts care has been taken to preserve the orthography of the originals—except that the capitalization and the punctuation, both of which are often exceedingly doubtful, have been modified in order to secure greater clearness. The work of editing the letters has been performed by Mr. Waldo G. Leland and Dr. Edmund C. Burnett, of the staff of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington.

I.

PHILADELPHIE le 17 May 1780¹

En arrivant au Camp, Monsieur le chevalier, j'eus l'honneur de vous envoyer les dépêches du gouvernement, et la lecture de mes instructions² a dû achever de vous faire connoître les intentions du Roy dans le secours puissant que sa Majesté veut prêter à ses allies mais d'après ce que vous m'avez fait l'honneur de me dire sur le peu de détails que vous avés receu des Ministres de la Guerre et de la Marine, je vais me conformer à vos désirs en y ajoutant ce qui est parvenu à ma connoissance.

Mr. de Corny Commissaire des guerres est chargé des instructions de Monsieur le pr. de Montbarrey et de Mr. le c'te de Rochambeau.³ Je

¹ Archives du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères (Paris): Correspondance Politique, États-Unis, Supplément, tome XIV., fols. 85–86 v. All letters here printed are A. L. S. unless otherwise indicated.

² Vergennes's instructions to Lafayette of March 5, 1780, are printed in Doniol, *Histoire de la Participation de la France à l'Établissement des États-Unis*, IV. 314–320. The substance of the instructions is given in Perkins, *France in the American Revolution*, pp. 296–298.

³ Louis Éthis de Corny, commissary of troops, was sent to America with Lafayette to make the necessary preparations for the reception of the French troops under Rochambeau. He was instructed to purchase 100 caissons, 1200 to 1500 horses, 2000 head of cattle, 3000 sheep, and various other supplies. The funds he had received in France, 50,000 livres, were quite insufficient and he was obliged to depend upon Luzerne for raising the necessary further amount. The minister, although embarrassed by lack of instructions from his government, was

compte le trouver au camp à mon retour et vous demanderai vos ordres par lui, que lui même viendra recevoir dans peu de jours. Je vous ai en attendant donné une idée generale des besoins qu'aura Mr. de Rochambeau, et c'est d'après cet apperçu que vous avés la bonté de prendre les mesures preliminaires.

Mr. de Corny n'a avec lui que Cinquante mille francs, et on devoit lui donner des lettres de change que par un malentendu il n'a pas pu obtenir. Mais comme le Ministre lui fixe les achats à faire, comme ces emplettes doivent precéder l'arrivée des troupes, et que l'argent assigné dans l'état du fonds que je vous ai communiqué pour le departement d'approvisionnements est fort au dessous de ce qu'il en coutera surement, ce n'est que par vos secours pecuniaires que Mr. de Corny peut se trouver en etat de remplir les ordres dont il est chargé.

Avant de quitter Versailles, j'eus l'honneur de représenter au gouvernement que n'ayant en Amerique d'autre qualité que celle d'officier Americain, et mon devoir m'obligeant de m'adonner entierement au soin des troupes qui me seroient confiées, et à l'activité d'une vie purement militaire, je ne pouvois me mêler aucunement de la partie des finances, et des arrangements d'argeant vis a vis du Congrès. Je demandai que Mr. de Corny eut une lettre pour vous que lesdits arrangements devoient regarder, et representai que dans les achats à faire, je ne pouvois que donner des Conseils.

Il fut décidé, et Monsieur le pr. de Montbarrey me l'assura positivement "que je ne devois me considerer en Amerique que comme officier Americain, que ma mission se bornoit à annoncer au G'al Washington le secours envoyé, et à m'occuper avec lui des expeditions; que les autres arrangements vous regardoient, et que les détails d'approvisionnements étoient confiés à Mr. de Corny, enfin que je ne devois repondre que de mon zele à donner des conseils comme françois, et des secours comme Americain".

Vous trouverés, Monsieur le chevalier, plus de details dans les instructions de Mr. de Corny, et les lettres qu'il pouvoit avoir pour le recommander à vous. Je puis seulement vous prevenir que tous les arrangements doivent etre signés par vous, et vous assurer que les precautions dont vous vous occupés pour avoir mille bœufs, 1200 moutons et trois cent chevaux du Connecticut, ainsi que des farines, chevaux d'artillerie, et waggons de Pensilvanie, des chevaux de selle de Virginie et Maryland, de la bierre, du cydre, les preparatifs pour quelques bâtimens ecuries, et les lettres de change que vous tirerés sur le tresor de la guerre, se rapportent entierement aux instructions de Mr. de Corny et aux intentions du gouvernement qui dans tous ses projets m'a paru avant toutes choses compter sur vos soins, sur vos secours, et y mettre la plus grande confiance.

Quelques soient les instructions de Mr. de Corny, je connois trop son able on his own security to procure some 600,000 livres. De Corny was given by Congress a brevet commission of lieutenant-colonel of cavalry. For details respecting de Corny and his instructions, and the efforts of Luzerne to raise funds, see Balch, *French in America*, I. 101, II. 55, 88; Stone, *Our French Allies*, pp. 189, 192, 193; *Journals of the Continental Congress* (ed. Hunt), June 5, 1780; Luzerne to Vergennes, June 3, 1780, in *Aff. Étr., Corresp. Pol., États-Unis*, XII. 62 (copy in Library of Congress, French Alliance Transcripts, box 7); Luzerne to Lafayette, *ibid.*, Supplément, XIV. 108-110 v. The Prince de Montbarrey was of course the Minister of War.

honnêteté pour ne pas vous assurer qu'il sera charmé de concerter avec Mr. Holker⁴ ou telle autre personne que vous designerez toutes les mesures qui vous paraissent concourir au bien public.

Permettes moi, Monsieur le chevalier, de rappeler à votre idée deux points interessans: le premier est de savoir si les troupes françoises seront payées et payeront elles mêmes en or ou en papier,⁵ le second est que par l'incertitude des expéditions il me paroitroit ruineux pour Mrs. les officiers d'acheter des chevaux qu'au bout de quinze jours ils seront peutêtre obligés d'abandonner pour entreprendre une autre operation maritime, et qu'ayant egard à la cherté de toutes choses le Roi devroit ou en partie ou ce qui vaudroit mieux totalement se charger de cette depense.

Quant à moi, Monsieur le chevalier, je ne suis ici qu'un officier ameri-
cain, et en cette qualité je me croirai heureux qu'aucune partie de mes
pouvoirs puisse concourir à vos desirs; donner avec franchise mon opi-
nion, et executer avec zele vos ordres, voilà le departement qui me regarde,
et je m'acquitterai de ces deux devoirs avec un plaisir egal au sincere
et respectueux attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'etre

Votre très humble et obeissant
serviteur

LAFAYETTE

J'ai l'honneur de vous remettre,

1^{re} Mes instructions, 2d un projet signé de Mr. le c'te de Vergennes, 3^o
la 1^{re} instruction de Mr. de Corny et deux autres lettres de Mr. le pr.
de Montbarrey, 4^o Une grande lettre de Monsieur de Sartine, 5^{me} les
etats de situation du detachement;⁶ je ne perdrai pas un moment à vous
envoyer Mr. de Cornv.

L.F.

II.

AU QUARTIER GENERAL le 24 May 1780⁷

Cette lettre-ci, Monsieur le chevalier, vous sera remise par Mr. de
Corny; il avoit une grande impatience d'aller prendre vos ordres, mais
suivant [ce] que nous en etions convenus j'ai cru devoir l'arrêter ici pour
des arrangements preliminaires. Son zele, son honnêteté, et ses con-
noissances m'assurent que vous trouverez un agrement particulier dans
les affaires que vous aures à traiter avec lui.

Les lettres qu'il aura pour vous, ses instructions détaillées, et tout ce
qu'il pourra vous dire lui même vous mettront au fait de tous les objets de
sa Mission et des moyens qu'il a de les remplir.

⁴ John Holker, consul-general and naval agent of France.

⁵ The question as to whether purchases for the French should be paid for in paper or in specie is discussed by Luzerne in his despatch to Vergennes of June 4, 1780, *ibid.*, XII. 63 (copy in L. C., French Alliance Transcripts, box 7). It was feared that the use of specie by the French would greatly depreciate American paper. Congress voted that "it is the opinion of Congress that the public service will be best promoted by having the same currency made use of, as far as may be, to procure supplies for the forces of his Most Christian Majesty as for those of these United States." *Journals*, June 5, 1780.

⁶ For Lafayette's instructions see *supra*, note 2. The "projet" was the secret instructions printed by Doniol with the formal instructions. The instructions of de Corny have been described in note 3; the other documents have not been located.

⁷ Fols. 91-92 v. Morristown.

Dans une longue conversation que nous avons eue avec le General Washington, et le G'al Greene, il a fait differentes questions dont on lui donnera demain les reponses.⁸ Si le Quartier Maitre general⁹ de notre armée peut l'engager a fournir le quinze de juin sur la Rivière du Nord les caissons et chariots, les chevaux de monture et d'artillerie demandés par Mr. le c'te de Rochambeau, et si les fournitures se font d'une maniere sûre et œconomique, il paroît que votre intention sera remplie, que les achats de ce genre faits par Mr. Holker serviront de suplement à ce que le G'al Greene ne pourroit pas procurer, et que les soins de l'agent general de la Marine¹⁰ nous deviendront plus particulièrement importants pour l'article des provisions.

En vous renvoyant aux reponses du G'al Greene que je ne connois pas encore parfaitement, je me permettrai de faire une observation; c'est que par ma derniere conversation avec Mr. le c'te de Maurepas, il ne paroissoit pas que le Ministre fut décidé au transport des 150 chevaux d'officiers dont parle Mr. le c'te de Rochambeau.

Ce que vous me dites dans votre note, Monsieur le chevalier, sur les bâtimens-ecuries dont Mr. Holker doit se pourvoir, me semble etre un article d'autant plus important que dans des expeditions maritimes les batiments transportent à la fois les chevaux de selle et d'artillerie des troupes françoises et Americaines.

Quoique persuadé qu'il est necessaire de s'adresser aux gouvernements pour les premiers preparatifs d'approvisionemens, le G'al Washington pense que dans la suite il sera plus economique de se procurer les bœufs, moutons, et [*sic*] par des marchés avec des particuliers.

Vous verrés, Monsieur le chevalier, que nous avons consulté le G'al Greene sur la maniere de nourrir par entreprise tous les chevaux de l'armée françoise.

Quant a l'hospital de la Providence, le general Washington fait partir le docteur Craig¹¹ pour chercher un emplacement convenable, et d'après une lettre dont il est muni pour le gouverneur, il pourra s'occuper des moyens d'avoir la viande fraiche, les volaïlles, le lait, les legumes dont les malades auront besoin. Il est aussi chargé de chercher des maisons propres à servir de magazin pour les differents articles dont l'armée françoise voudra se debarrasser.

Le docteur Craig ne prendra cependant aucun parti, à moins que l'escadre françoise n'arrivat subitement; dans tout autre cas, il doit attendre Mr. d'Annemours,¹² et ne lui donner que des renseignements sur les moyens d'executer sa mission. L'objet du G'al Washington en l'envoyant à la Providence, est non seulement d'aider Mr. d'Annemours, mais plus particulièrement encore de prevenir la circonstance inattendue ou l'escadre entreroit dans le port avant l'arrivée du consul. Si Mr.

⁸ Cf. Washington to Schuyler, May 21, in Ford, *Writings*, VIII. 282.

⁹ I. e., General Nathanael Greene, who at this time was quartermaster general.

¹⁰ I. e., Holker.

¹¹ Dr. James Craik, at this time assistant director general of hospitals, later chief physician and surgeon of the army. He was at Fort Necessity in 1755 with Washington, and after the Revolution was the latter's family physician. For details respecting his mission to Providence see Stone, pp. 189-198; Washington to Heath, June 2, in Ford, *Writings*, VIII. 307; cf. also Bronson, *History of Brown University*, p. 71 et seq.

¹² D'Annemours or d'Anmours, one of the French consuls in the United States.

d'Annemours passe par le quartier general, nous lui donnerons des lettres de recommandation.

C'est d'après vos conversations avec Mrs. Holker et de Corny que vous puvés décider si le premier doit se rendre à l'armée. Lorsque Mr. de Corny aura rempli à Philadelphie les objets qui l'y conduisent, et ceux dont vous voudrés le charger, il paroît desirer de visiter lui même les etablissements de la Providence en passant par le quartier general, et le Connecticut. Il est à souhaiter qu'il ait fait le voyage assés promptement, pour retourner au point ou on decidera le débarquement des troupes françoises et pour rendre compte à leur General des differents objets dont il est chargé.

Voilà, Monsieur le chevalier, toutes les reponses à la note que vous m'aviés remise. Si vous avés de nouveaux ordres à me donner, je serai bien heureux de les executer.

L'amitié particuliere qui m'attache à Monsieur de Corny, me fait penser avec plaisir que vous partagerés mon opinion sur son compte. Il ne sera pas moins empressé que moi à se mettre sous votre direction; Agréés, je vous prie, l'hommage du tendre attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'etre, Monsieur le Chevalier, Votre

tres humble et obeissant
serviteur

LAFAYETTE

III.

AU QUARTIER GENERAL le 24 May 1780¹³

Les objets dont j'ai a vous parler, Monsieur le chevalier, etant de nature differente, j'ai cru devoir les diviser en trois lettres, et consacrer celle-ci à la politique.

Le Comité n'est pas content de ses pouvoirs;¹⁴ ils disent qu'ils ne peuvent que recommander, et à moins de prendre sur eux tous les risques ils ne sont pas en etat de mettre en activité les ressources du païs. Le Congrès doit recevoir de leur Comité les plus fortes representations à cet egard; mais pour ne pas perdre de tems, ils ont ecrit une lettre aux differents etats dont nous avons besoin, et cette lettre doit, disent-ils, produire de bons effets.

Nous serons, j'espere, en etat d'agir vers le quinze de juin. Notre armée commencera alors à etre augmentée, et dans les premiers jours de juillet nous aurons tout ce que nous pouvons rassembler et reunir pendant la Campagne.

Si cependant l'escadre arrivoit sur le champ, le General est determiné à forcer de moyens, et dût-il oublier les formes ordinaires, nous ne consulterons que la necessité de nous mettre en marche, et de cooperer promptement avec les troupes françoises.

J'ai été d'autant plus à portée de connoitre cette disposition que nous avons eu ces jours-ci la nouvelle qu'une flotte françoise etoit devant New-York. Je n'ai pris aucune confiance dans cette histoire, mais par

¹³ Fols. 93-94 v.

¹⁴ This was the "committee to proceed to headquarters" elected by Congress on April 13, 1780. It consisted of Philip Schuyler, John Mathews, and Nathaniel Peabody. The instructions of the committee were voted on April 12; see *Journals* at dates mentioned. The letter from the committee to the states, referred to here, was dated May 25, and is to be found in L. C., Cont. Cong. Papers, Washington Papers, and elsewhere.

un excès de précaution j'ai envoyé Mr. de Gimat¹⁵ sur la Côte avec une lettre pour le Commandant de cette escadre prétendue.

Mr. le chev. de Fayolles,¹⁶ et Mr. de Rochefontaine¹⁷ sont partis pour les points de Judith et de Sekonnet avec des instructions et des signaux. J'ai parlé de l'établissement d'une chaîne d'express, et si vous en avez une du Cap Henry à Philadelphie, je tâcherai d'en former la continuation de Philadelphie à Rhode island.¹⁸

Par toutes les nouvelles de l'est, il paroît qu'il y a eu dans les îles une bataille navale. Les papie[r]s Anglois se donnent l'avantage, les Américains décident en notre faveur. La seule raison que j'ai de compter sur notre victoire est que les deux flottes étoient, dit-on, égales.¹⁹

Dès qu'il y aura au quartier général la moindre nouvelle intéressante j'aurai sur le champ l'honneur de vous en faire part; j'ose vous demander la même grâce, Monsieur le chevalier, et tâcherai de la mériter par mon exactitude à vous instruire de nos progrès et de nos efforts pour nous mettre en état d'agir.

Si le Congrès n'a pas rappelé les Brigades du Maryland, il paroît que nous devons renoncer à cet avantage.²⁰

J'ai envoyé à Rhode island des renseignements sur les points où il seroit plus sûr et plus commode de placer les vaisseaux et les troupes françaises.

Je compte sur vos bontés, Monsieur le chevalier, pour faire partir autant de copies de mes lettres à Mr. de Vergennes que vous en envoyez de votre part. Dès que j'aurai quelqu'un propre à remplir ce soin, je tâcherai d'éviter à Messieurs vos secrétaires une telle peine.

Agreez, je vous prie, l'hommage des tendres sentiments avec lesquels j'ai l'honneur d'être

Votre très humble et obéissant serviteur

LAFAYETTE

Permettéz, je vous prie, que Monsieur de Marbois²¹ trouve icy un million de tendres compliments, et les assurances de mon Attachement.

¹⁵ De Gimat, colonel and aide-de-camp to Lafayette; he came to America in 1777 as a volunteer. See Balch, II. 135.

¹⁶ De Fayolles, lieutenant-colonel, came to America in 1777. See Doniol, III. 223; the *Boston Gazette* of June 12, 1780, refers to his death as of June 8.

¹⁷ Bichet de Rochefontaine, brevet captain of engineers, later major. See Balch, II. 217.

¹⁸ On June 5, Congress voted "That the governors of . . . Virginia and Maryland be requested immediately to engage trusty persons in those states respectively, at proper distances from each other, on the main road from Cape Henry, in Virginia, to Philadelphia, to hold themselves in readiness, should the French fleet be discovered off that cape or the adjacent coast, to forward intelligence thereof . . . in the most expeditious manner." *Journals*, June 5, 1780.

¹⁹ The French fleet under de Guichen and the British fleet under Rodney had three engagements in West Indian waters on April 17, May 15, and May 19, See Mahan, *Influence of Sea Power*, p. 378; Chevalier, *Histoire de la Marine Française pendant la Guerre de l'Indépendance Américaine*, p. 185 et seq.; *Boston Gazette*, May 29; cf. *infra*, letters of May 27 and June 30.

²⁰ In April de Kalb had been sent with troops of the Maryland and Delaware lines to reinforce Lincoln. He had only reached Petersburg when he learned of the fall of Charleston. Winsor, VI. 475.

²¹ Barbé Marbois was at this time secretary of the French legation in Philadelphia; later he was appointed consul-general. Wharton, *Diplomatic Correspondence*, I. 426.

D'après la demande de Mr. de la Touche²² vis à vis du Conseil de Boston qui a eu le meilleur effet comme j'avois eu l'honneur de vous le dire, on me mande que le conseil l'a prié de faire une croisière de huit jours, et je vois avec plaisir qu'il rentrera dans le tems ou votre lettre peut arriver à Boston.

IV.

AU QUARTIER GENERAL le 24 May 1780²³

D'après la lettre que vous me fîtes l'honneur de me communiquer, Monsieur le chevalier, au sujet du duel entre Mr. le ch'r de Fayolles et Mr. de Valnais,²⁴ vous vous rappelés que je me contentai d'applaudir à la conduite de Mr. de la Touche, et qu'avant de former un jugement j'attendis des éclaircissements sur cette affaire.

Il m'en est parvenu depuis qui fixent mon opinion, et en empêchant Mr. de Fayolles de se rendre comme il comptoit auprès de vous, parce que je croiois sa presence necessaire à Rhode island, il m'a prié d'avoir l'honneur de vous écrire pour vous faire connoître ce que j'ai appris, et ce que lui même avoit l'intention de vous dire.

A un diner de ceremonie donné par Mr. de la Touche aux Membres du Conseil de Boston, Mr. de Valnais est venu avec l'uniforme de colonel commandant du Regiment d'Artois dragons, premiere faute très reprehensible. Pendant le diner, il a manqué de respect à Messieurs du Conseil et à Monsieur de la Touche en troublant la fête par des regards et propos offensans contre un des convives, Mr. le chev. de Fayolles, seconde incartade non moins déplacée; et lorsque pour éviter une scene Mr. de Fayolles a été se promener sur le pont Mr. de Valnais a manqué d'une maniere essentielle au pavillon du Roy par l'insulte la plus grave à cet officier, troisieme faute que la qualité de Consul rend encore plus impardonable.

Lorsque le lendemain il se battit au pistolet avec Mr. de Fayolles et fut blessé dans le combat, le Conseil de Boston ne se mêlat aucunement de l'affaire, et des personnes de consideration assurerent Mr. de Fayolles qu'il pouvoit rester à Boston avec toute tranquillité.

Des amis de Mr. de Valnais ayant repandu que Mr. de la Touche avoit envoyé ses officiers pour servir de temoin, le Capitaine de la frégatte eut de Mr. de Valnais lui même un desaveu de cette fausseté.

Il paroît qu'on approuve generalement la conduite de Mr. de Fayolles, et cet officier etant par sa naissance, par sa qualité de Capitaine commandant au Rgt. de Brie, par l'interest vif que des personnes respectables prennent à lui, etant dis-je plus particulièrement obligé à rendre compte

²² Louis R. M. La Vassor de la Touche-Tréville, captain commanding the French frigate *Hermione*, the vessel in which Lafayette had just returned to America. See Doniol, IV. 280, 285; Tower, II. 93, 95; Heath, *Memoirs of the American War*, p. 248.

²³ Fols. 95-96 v.

²⁴ De Valnais was French consul at Boston. Blanchard refers to the duel in his *Journal*, pp. 51-52; the account given here by Lafayette is one of the fullest to be had of this affair. Luzerne approved Lafayette's attitude in his letter to the latter of May 28: "Je suis fort aise . . . du parti que vous avez pris d'envoyer Mr. de Fayolles à une destination particuliere. J'ai écrit à cet officier. J'espère qu'il m'aidera par sa conduite ultérieure à prévenir les suites de son affaire, et qu'il me mettra à même de seconder l'interêt que vous et M. le C^{te}. de Broglie prenés à Lui." Aff. Étr., États-Unis, Supplément, XIV. 108.

de sa conduite, étoit parti de Boston dans l'intention de se rendre auprès de vous.

Il comptoit vous dire, Monsieur le chevalier, qu'il venoit vous porter plainte contre Mr. de Valnais qui par une insulte aussi grossière l'avoit forcé d'oublier son caractère public; que son affaire n'avoit aucune suite exceptés celle qu'il pouvoit lui même y donner; qu'il prenoit la liberté de vous demander la punition du Consul; mais si le Consul concevoit son caractère public, il vous prioit dans tous les cas de ne pas oublier quelle insulte il avoit reçue.

Comme mes instructions portoient d'envoyer dans tous les points des officiers français, et que Mr. le chev. de Fayolles m'a paru propre à cette commission j'ai cru devoir l'engager à négliger pour l'instant ses affaires personnelles. Mais en lui donnant une marque de confiance qu'il n'auroit sûrement pas obtenue si j'avois eu le moindre doute sur sa bonne conduite dans cette affaire, j'ai cru ne pouvoir sans injustice refuser de vous soumettre ce qu'il vouloit avoir l'honneur de vous dire lui même.

Reçevés je vous prie, Monsieur le chevalier, l'assurance du tendre attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'être Votre très humble et obéissant serviteur

LAFAYETTE

V.

AU QUARTIER GENERAL le 25 May 1780²⁵

Lettre secrète

J'ai l'honneur de vous prévenir, Monsieur le chevalier, que pour tromper les ennemis sur l'objet de notre expédition, le General Washington desire que je fasse un projet de proclamation aux habitants du Canada.²⁶ Cet écrit sera imprimé avec le plus grand secret, mais on aura attention de le faire passer à New-York. Quant aux autres exemplaires, exceptés celui de New York ils seront jetés au feu à l'arrivée des troupes françaises; ainsi je puis dire tout ce qu'il me plaira dans un ouvrage destiné à ne jamais paroître.

Si vous approuvés cette idée, et si vous voulés me faire passer une Marque avec les armes du Roy, elle pourra servir à tromper encore d'avantage les espions de l'ennemi.

LAFAYETTE

Si vous me repondés sur cet article, il faudroit que ce fut par une occasion particuliere et bien sûre.

²⁵ Fol. 97.

²⁶ A copy of the proclamation is in the volume containing the present letters, fols. 98-101. In it Lafayette announced the sending of French troops to America and called upon the Canadians to unite with the combined French-American forces. The tenor of the declaration is quite opposed to that of the instructions to the spies sent to Canada by Lafayette (see *infra*, note 73). The purpose of the former was of course to deceive the English into believing that Canada instead of New York was the objective of the operations to be undertaken upon the arrival of Rochambeau. Probably, however, the British were not greatly misled. Cf. Tower, II. 113-115; Washington to Lafayette, May 19, in Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 44; same to Arnold, June 4, *ibid.*, 72; same to Greene, May 31, *ibid.*, 65; Doniol, IV. 370.

VI.

AU QUARTIER GENERAL le 25 May 1780²⁷

Ce n'est pas sans peine, Monsieur le chevalier, que nous avons obtenu du General Greene qu'il prendroit des engagements. Il a dans le moment beaucoup d'affaires, mais en consentant à se charger des notes, il m'a fait les deux observations suivantes.

1^{ere} qu'il est necessaire de lui fournir l'argeant en nature.

2^{eme} que ne pouvant pas prevoir les arrangements qu'il feroit, au point d'en fixer le prix, ce soin devoit etre abandonné à sa discretion pour faire les meilleurs marchés possibles.

D'après ce que vous me marqués dans votre note, j'ai cru remplir vos intentions en priant Mr. de Corny d'écrire une seconde lettre au General Greene, ou il lui propose de se charger de la totalité des chariots et chevaux dont nous avons besoin, en ne fixant que le tems et la quantité ainsi que le lieu du rendés vous. Bien entendu que cette lettre est une simple supposition subordonnée à ce qu'il vous plaira de decider.

Le General Greene prendra dans sa reponse les engagements qu'il croit pouvoir remplir, et attendra pour commencer ses operations la reponse definitive qui ne peut etre envoyée que de Philadelphie.

Aussitôt qu'il aura receu cette derniere lettre de Monsieur de Corny autorisé par vous, il se mettra en devoir d'executer ses engagements aux conditions ci-dessus mentionnées. Il observe que les preparatifs ne peuvent commencer qu'à l'instant ou il recevra ce dernier mot de Philadelphie.

Le General Greene n'étant animé que par le desir d'obliger, vous prie, Monsieur le chevalier, d'examiner si vous avés des moyens plus prompts, plus sûrs, ou plus economiques pour remplir les intentions du Roy, car dans ce cas, et même à avantage egal, il desire etre dispensé de ces soins dont il ne se charge que par bonne volonté et par zele pour la Cause Commune.

Agréés, je vous prie, l'assurance du tendre attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'être

Votre tres humble et
obeissant Serviteur

LAFAYETTE

VII.

MORRIS TOWN ce 27 May 1780²⁸

Si je ne suis pas en etat, Monsieur le chevalier, de vous donner sur le combat des isles une nouvelle certaine, je vais au moins vous donner une probabilité de plus en notre faveur.

Le Colonel Sherburne arrivant des etats de l'est assure qu'il est arrivé un bâtiment après un passage très court, et ce bâtiment rapporte d'une maniere très circonstanciée " que les deux flottes egales en nombre se sont battues depuis le matin jusqu'au soir avec acharnement; que celle des ennemis a été ecrasée au point de ne pouvoir plus tenir la mer et qu'ils se sont enfuis dans leurs ports; que le vaisseau de Rodney est le plus maltraité", et l'on a meme dit au C'l Sherburne le nombre de tués et blessés à bord de cet Amiral. Le C'l Sherburne ne doute aucunement de cette nouvelle, et pour etre sincere, j'avoüerai que je n'en suis pas moins persuadé.

²⁷ Fols. 102-102 v.

²⁸ Fols. 104-104 v.

Le paquet d'avril est arrivé à Newyork; il a quitté l'Angleterre vers le quinze, mais les nouvelles de France sont de la fin de Mars. Il ne parle pas de ce que nous attendons; on avoit donné ordre aux bâtiments Anglois à convoyer pour l'Amérique de se joindre à leur escorte vers le milieu d'avril. Il parle aussi de l'amiral Graves qui n'étoit pas parti.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, Agrées je vous prie l'hommage des tendres sentiments que je vous ai voués.

LAFAYETTE

Mille compliments, je vous prie, à Monsieur de Marbois.

VIII.

MORRIS TOWN le 3 juin 1780²⁹

Je n'ai reçu qu'avant hier, Monsieur le chevalier, la lettre dont vous m'avez honoré le vingt six du mois dernier, et la marche lente du chariot qui la portoit m'a fait penser que je devois attendre pour vous écrire les réponses à mes lettres portées par Monsieur de Corny. Elles vous rendoient compte de mes démarches depuis mon retour au Quartier General, et comme nous étions convenus que dès l'instant de mon arrivée à Boston il n'y en avoit pas eu un seul de perdu, vous verrez que jusqu'à aujourd'hui nous n'avons pas à regretter l'employ de notre tems. J'attendois avec la plus vive impatience vos réponses à mes lettres, mais je prevoiois que le retard étoit employé à nous assurer de meilleurs arrangements.

Vos lettres du 28, 29, et 31 May me sont parvenues hier si tard que je n'ai pu les communiquer au General Washington. Mon premier soin ce matin a été d'en conférer avec lui, et de peser avec la plus grande attention tous les articles sur lesquels vous demandés réponse.³⁰ Le reste de la matinée a été employé à me rendre chez le General Greene et causer avec lui sur les deux articles pour lesquels vous desirés son assistance. Je lui ai ensuite écrit une lettre détaillée, et j'attendrai pour fermer ma lettre la réponse qu'il a promis de m'envoyer.

Sans vous, Monsieur le chevalier, sans votre crédit, et les peines que vous avez prises, il étoit impossible de bien remplir les intentions du Roy. Avec votre secours, je ne doute pas que Mr. de Corny n'y réussisse. Les 600,000 livres sont un grand article, et l'arrangement que vous faites en faveur de notre papier rend aux états unis un service bien essentiel.³¹ La résolution relative aux deserteurs fera, je crois, un grand plaisir aux généraux français.³²

En partant pour la Providence le docteur Craig avoit reçu des ordres étendus pour tous les arrangements préliminaires. J'espère en conséquence que l'absence de Mr. d'Annemours pourra être remplacée par le docteur, et le General Washington avoit prié le gouverneur Greene³³ de

²⁹ Fols. 116-118 v.

³⁰ Cf. Washington to Luzerne, June 5, in Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 73.

³¹ Cf. *supra*, notes 3 and 5.

³² "Resolved, That it be recommended to the legislatures of these United States to pass laws for the punishment of such persons as shall encourage desertions from the fleets or armies of any foreign power who shall prosecute the war in America in conjunction with these United States, and for recovering such deserters as shall endeavour to conceal themselves among the inhabitants." *Journals*, May 27, 1780.

³³ Washington to Governor Greene, May 25, in Stone, *French Allies*, p. 189 et seq.

donner toutes les facilités possibles; je crois cependant que si vous trouvez Mr. d'Annemours il sera bien fait de l'envoyer sur le champ. Il est à souhaiter que Mr. de Corny s'y rende bientôt et y porte l'argent dont vous me parlez. Comme le Major General Heath devoit se rendre de Boston à l'armée, le General lui a mandé de s'arrêter à la Providence, d'y préparer ce qui dependra de lui pour la reception de l'armée et de la flotte françoise, enfin d'interposer son autorité et ses bons offices pour tout ce qui pourra leur etre avantageux et agreable.³⁴

Après avoir discuté dans le plus grand detail les besoins des troupes françoises et les probabilités de nos operations, le General Washington ne croit pas devoir diminuer le nombre de chariots et chevaux d'artillerie dont vous faites mention et qui a été fixé par Mr. le c^{te} de Rochambeau.³⁵

Quant aux chevaux de la legion de Lauzun,³⁶ le General ne pense pas qu'on en ait pour le moment un besoin urgent. Cinquante ou soixante chevaux pour porter des messages, pour escorter les officiers generaux lui paroissent suffire dans la disette d'argent ou nous nous trouvons. Si nous devenions plus riches, il desireroit aller jusqu'au nombre requis pour former une Compagnie suivant l'ordonnance françoise. Si vous n'achetés que cinquante chevaux pour Mr. de Lauzun, voila 300,000 livres d'épargnées.

Si Newyork devient impossible, une expedition en Canada paroît offrir de grands avantages et l'on pouvoit bien y penser en cas que le congres, divisé à ce sujet finit par en approuver le plan.³⁷ Je ne parle cependant ici que comme particulier, et les nouvelles de l'ennemi peuvent seules determiner les projets du General.

On m'a promis que dans trois jours nous pourrons ecrire par la nouvelle chaine d'exprés.

Tout ce que nous entendons dire ici semble confirmer l'avantage de Mr. le c^{te} de Guichen, mais rien d'officiel encore, et même rien qui porte un caractere bien authentique.

Si l'on en croit la publication par autorité, les ennemis auroient pris Charlestown le 12 du mois dernier;³⁸ mais j'avoüe que j'ai toujours été au nombre des incredules. Au moment ou j'apprendrai quelque chose de l'armée de Clinton, je m'empresserai de vous en instruire, et d'ecrire au cap Henry par votre chaine depuis Philadelphie si elle est etablie.

Comme nous avons des farines et autres provisions appartenantes au

³⁴ Washington to Heath, June 2, in Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 71; cf. Heath to Washington, July 12, in Sparks, *Letters to Washington*, III. 12. See also Heath's letters to Washington in *Heath Papers* (Mass. Hist. Soc., *Collections*, seventh series, vol. V.), p. 64 *et seq.*, also Lafayette to Heath, June 11, *ibid.*, p. 66.

³⁵ Luzerne had suggested the possibility of reducing the number of horses and wagons asked for by Rochambeau, and had left the matter to be decided by Washington and Lafayette. Luzerne to Lafayette, May 31, in *Aff. Étr., États-Unis*, Supplément, XIV. 110.

³⁶ Armand Louis de Gontaut-Biron, duc de Lauzun. Lauzun's legion was a separate organization in the army of Rochambeau. Wharton, I. 411; Balch, II. 160.

³⁷ The idea of an attack on Canada appealed to Lafayette; he had strongly urged it in the fall of 1778, but the project was disapproved of by Washington and Congress. See *Journals*, 1778, *passim*, and January 1, 1779; cf. Tower, II. 11-23, 47-48.

³⁸ Cf. Washington to General Robert Howe, June 1, 1780, Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 69.

Continent à transporter sur la Rivière du Nord, et comme la formation de ce Magazin est un preliminaire necessaire à notre cooperation avec les troupes françaises, nous vous demandons, Monsieur le chevalier, que les chariots engagés par Mr. Mitchele,³⁹ et ceux du G'al Greene soient chargés des differentes articles qui se trouveront sur leur chemin en se rendant à la place du rendés vous. Si vous approuvés cet arrangement qui ne retarde point l'execution des vostres le General donnera ses ordres en consequence. Si même par un hasard imprévu les troupes françaises étoient obligées de retarder leur depart de Brest, le Continent pouvoit alors vous proposer de prendre le louage des chariots a son compte jusqu'à l'arrivée de l'escadre

Dans ma lettre au G'al Greene, je lui demande d'avoir les chariots avant le vingt de juin ou sur la Rivière du Nord ou sur celle du Connecticut. Je copie mot à mot les conditions demandées dans les lettres que j'ai receûes, et je le prie en même tems de trouver un homme qui se charge de nourrir les chevaux de l'armée, et les boeufs et moutons qui la suivront.

J'ai lu, Monsieur le chevalier, vos reponses au Memoire de Mr. Corny, et elles me paroissent remplir dans toute leur perfection les vues du gouvernement que mon sejour à Versailles m'a mis à portée de connoître.

Ce n'est pas vous, Monsieur le chevalier, qui avés besoin d'excuse pour ne pas m'écrire de votre main les longues lettres; c'est à moi de vous demander pardon pour vous forcer à lire mon griffonage, mais j'ai eu l'honneur de vous raconter comment mon Secretaire étoit retourné à Paris.

J'espere recevoir incessamment de vos nouvelles, nous n'en avons pas encore receu des differents etats; j'ai ecrit de mon coté et j'ai tacher [sic] d'ajouter dans la balance le peu de poids que peut avoir mon influence particuliere. Je m'empresserai à vous mander tout ce qui me paroitra devoir vous interesser.

Voulés vous bien, Monsieur le chevalier, presenter à Monsieur de Marbois l'assurance de mon tendre attachement. Agrées, je vous prie, l'hommage de tous les sentiments, et de la sincere amitie avec laquelle je serai toute ma vie

Monsieur,

Votre tres humble et obeissant serviteur

LAFAYETTE

le 4 Juin à Cinq heures du Matin

Je reçois enfin la reponse du General Greene, et l'attends depuis longtemps ce matin pour fermer ma lettre; Mr de Corny pourra rapporter celle que je joins ici, et causera lui-même au Quartier General avec le G'al Greene. l'expres me permet d'etre demain à dix ou onze heures à Philadelphie.

VIII.

AU QUARTIER GENERAL PRÈS SPRING FIELD
12 Juin 1780⁴⁰

Permettés-moi, Monsieur le chevalier, d'avoir l'honneur de vous donner quelques eclaircissements sur une lettre de Mr. de Corny dont il a bien voulu m'envoyer la copie. C'est à propos des waggons que nous

³⁹ John Mitchell, deputy quartermaster general in Philadelphia.

⁴⁰ Fol. 119. Springfield in New Jersey.

desirions charger de provisions Continentales, et je ne voudrais pas que l'expression *insister* dont se sert Mr. de Corny put donner trop de force à la demande que j'ai eu l'honneur de vous faire. Il est vrai que le General Washington a *repeté que cet arrangement lui sembloit plus avantageux aux interests communs de la cooperation*, mais sans insister aucunement, il laisse entierement cette affaire à votre desicion, et vous prie de faire ce qui vous paraîtra à vous-même le plus convenable.

Notre armée et celle des ennemis sont dans la même situation, et entre autres contrarietés que nous cause cette sortie de Knypausen,⁴¹ je compte pour beaucoup le retard qu'éprouvent mes reponses à vos dernieres lettres et à celle de Monsieur de Marbois.

LAFAYETTE

IX

SUR LES HAUTEURS PRÈS SPRING FIELD le
15 Juin 1780⁴²

J'ai l'honneur de vous envoyer, Monsieur le chevalier, les dépêches de Monsieur de la Touche, et vous y verrés le malheureux evenement qui nous prive de Mr. le ch'r de Fayolles.⁴³ Les soins de Mr. de la Touche ont sauvé les instructions et les papiers; comme il n'y avoit pas de tems à perdre, j'ai sur le champ mandé à l'autre officier françois (Mr. de Rochefontaine) qu'il devoit se charger d'exécuter seul la mission que j'avois divisé entre lui et Mr. de Fayolles. L'impossibilité d'aller promptement à bord en partant des points Judith et Sekonnet, et celle de confier avec quelque sureté des papiers sur Blok island, obligent les officiers françois à rester sur l'isle de Rhode island pour porter mes lettres à l'escadre. Il suffira donc de Mr. de Rochefontaine sur ce point pour avoir les dépêches et mots de reconnoissance, et j'ai prié Mr. de la Touche de faire avec le gouverneur Greene les meilleurs dispositions pour qu'à l'apparence de la flotté les signaux convenus fussent élevés sur les points mentionnés dans mes instructions.

Vous verrés, Monsieur le chevalier, qu'en se rendant à Philadelphie Mr. de la Touche a fait deux prises Angloises, et a soutenu un combat très vif avec *l'Iris* fregatte ennemie qui étoit envoyée de Newyork à Hallifax.⁴⁴ Comme je connoissois vos intentions, et que votre reponse seroit arrivée trop tard j'ai cru devoir prevenir d'avance Mr. de la Touche que sa presence à Philadelphie étoit interessante pour des provisions: mais je ne sais s'il pourra etre assés tôt réparé pour s'y rendre. Si vous avés d'autres ordres à lui faire parvenir, je tacherai de les envoyer avec toute la diligence possible.

J'ai l'honneur de joindre ici les lettres de Mr. de la Touche pour Monsieur de Sartine qu'il vous prie de vouloir bien faire passer par deux occasions differentes, et je vous supplie de mettre avec celle qui est decachetée la lettre de moi à ce Ministre ou je lui parle du combat de l'Hermione. J'en ai joint un duplicata à la lettre cachetée, qui n'est qu'une copie de l'autre.

⁴¹ This was the attempt of General Knypausen to invade New Jersey from New York with nineteen regiments of British troops. Cf. Bancroft, *History*, V. 423; Washington to President of Congress, June 10, Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 75.

⁴² Fols. 120-120 v.

⁴³ Cf. *supra*, note 16.

⁴⁴ See Heath, *Memoirs*, pp. 249, 251-253, 256; Blanchard, *Journal*, p. 39; Boston *Gazette*, June 12, 1780.

Nous sommes toujours dans la même position, les ennemis restent tranquilles derriere Elizabeth town, et l'on se borne à quelques coups de fusils de postes avancés qui ne determinent rien: il paroît que le General Knypausen a envie de nous attaquer, mais il est retenu ou par la crainte de se compromettre ou par l'attente de Sir Henry Clinton. Soit qu'il veuille operer ici, ou faciliter un mouvement vers la Riviere du nord, ou simplement nous arrêter dans le jersay, il reussit à detourner une partie de notre attention des preparatifs necessaires à la cooperation. Je voudrois au moins que nous fussions joints par des recrûes de pensylvanie et de jersay.

Agréés, je vous prie, Monsieur le chevalier, l'hommage du tendre attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'être,

Votre tres humble et obeissant serviteur

LAFAYETTE

XI.

SUR LES HAUTEURS PRES SPRING FIELD le
20 juin 1780⁴⁵

Jai receu ce Matin, Monsieur le chevalier, la lettre dont vous m'avés honoré le seize de ce mois, et ne puis que m'affliger avec vous des fautes par lesquelles nous perdons un corps considerable de troupes.⁴⁶ Les efforts de lord Cornwallis pour faire revolter les Ecossais n'auront, je crois, que trop d'effet.⁴⁷ Il faut tâcher de reparer ici, mais nous avons besoin des troupes françaises, et nous n'en recevons encore aucune nouvelle.

Je suis charmé d'apprendre que les particuliers de Philadelphie montrent un patriotisme aussi utile;⁴⁸ il est facheux que le public représenté par leur dictateur⁴⁹ ne se soit pas rendu aux propositions du Comité et du Commandant et chef, etait refusé de completer les bataillons à 500 hommes: il paroît que l'état de jersay portera à ce nombre les trois Regiments qu'il a dans l'armée, et qu'à ces quinze cent soldats sous la banniere Continentale, ils ajouteront six cent miliciens employés par le General jusqu'au mois de janvier prochain. Le gouverneur Clinton me mande que nous serons contents de l'état de Newyork.⁵⁰

Je viens de lire au general la partie de votre lettre qui a rapport à la flotte francaise, à vos achats, vos esperances, et la farine que vous nous prêtés. Ce secours est essentiel, et nous le recevons avec reconnaissance.

⁴⁵ Fols. 124-125 v.

⁴⁶ Referring to the loss of Charleston?

⁴⁷ Cf. McCrady, *South Carolina in the Revolution*, pp. 549-560; Van Tyne, *American Revolution*, p. 298. Scottish merchants, citizens of Charleston, had presented a congratulatory address to Clinton.

⁴⁸ This refers to the offer of Philadelphia bankers and merchants to aid in securing supplies for the army. See *Journals*, June 22, 1780. A partial list of the "particuliers" is in Niles, *Principles and Acts of the Revolution*, p. 236.

⁴⁹ Doubtless this refers to Joseph Reed, president of the council of Pennsylvania, upon whom practically dictatorial powers had recently been conferred by the resolution of the assembly of June 1, 1780. See W. B. Reed, *Life and Correspondence of Joseph Reed*, II. 208; cf. Lafayette to Reed, May 31, *ibid.*; also Washington to Reed, May 28 and July 4, in Ford, *Writings*, VIII. 293, 329; Reed to Washington, June 5, July 12, in Sparks, *Letters to Washington*, II. 463; III. 15.

⁵⁰ Cf. Clinton to Washington, June 13, *ibid.*, II. 472.

Vos arrangements me paroissent avancer, et si comme patriote je vous en ai bien de l'obligation, elle augmente en raison de l'intérêt particulier que je prends à la Coopération. Il est bien utile, je crois, de préparer des navires pour le transport des chevaux. En un mot, Monsieur le chevalier, ce que vous avés fait ne pouvoit l'être que par vous, et cependant c'étoit le seul moyen de remplir les différents objets du gouvernement. Je suis tellement intéressé dans cette affaire, que je me sens quelquefois prêt à vous remercier pour mon propre compte comme le doit faire la France et l'Amérique.

Notre position n'a pas changé, et il ne s'est rien passé d'important sur ce côté-ci de l'eau. Les ennemis ont construit un pont de bateaux pour leur communication avec Staten island, ils en fortifient la tête du côté du Jersey, et par leur situation compacte semblent craindre de se compromettre. Le dix sept au soir l'amiral Arbuthnot a passé Sandy hook, et le dix huit il a fait une visite au G'al Knypausen. Nous apprenons ce matin que le G'al Clinton est arrivé, mais nous ne pouvons pas encore avoir de nouvelles bien certaines sur les vaisseaux et les troupes qu'ils ont ramené de Caroline. A moins d'accidents extraordinaires, nous recevrons cette nuit des intelligences sûres et détaillées;⁵¹ j'ai un exprès qui partira sur le champ pour Rhodeisland, et je vous enverrai des duplicatas pour le Cap Henry. Les nouvelles qu'aura le General fixeront son opinion sur les premières dispositions que pourront faire Mrs. les généraux français.

J'ai l'honneur de joindre ici, Monsieur le chevalier, des lettres de Mr. de la Touche pour France, que je prends la liberté de vous recommander, et particulièrement celles pour son pere et Mde. de Monthieu. Quant à moi, à moins d'une occasion bien sûre dont vous auriez la bonté de m'avertir, j'attendrai l'arrivée de l'escadre, et comme ils feront sûrement partir un bâtiment pour en porter la nouvelle, ne pensés vous pas, Monsieur le chevalier, qu'ils devoient être avertis d'attendre les dépêches dont vous pourriez les charger? Je vous demanderois alors la permission d'y joindre les miennes.

Si vous lisez la gazette de Newyork, Monsieur le Chevalier, vous y verrez une lettre du G'al Maxwell⁵² ou il se plaint de n'avoir pas de bottes. Nous sommes d'autant moins honteux de notre nudité qu'elle prouve la vostre et le patriotisme de l'armée Americaine; mais comme elle ne fait pas autant l'éloge du public que nous servons vous devriez bien conseiller à vos amis dans le Congrès d'imaginer un moyen pour vêtir les officiers de leur Armée.

Agrées, Monsieur le chevalier, l'hommage du tendre attachement que je vous ai voué.

LAFAYETTE

Oserai-je vous prier de faire un million de compliments à Monsieur de Marbois, et de vous informer si le fils du C'l Nevile, appelé le Lt. C'l Presley Neville⁵³ mon ancien aide de Camp se trouve être au nombre des prisonniers?

⁵¹ Cf. information from secret agent in New York, dated June 24 (Friedenwald, *Calendar of Washington Manuscripts in the Library of Congress*, p. 153), according to which Clinton reached Sandy Hook on the 23d with 5000 men.

⁵² Brigadier-General William Maxwell of New Jersey. He resigned from the army on July 25, 1780.

⁵³ Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel Presley Neville, taken prisoner at Charleston May 12, 1780, exchanged in May, 1781. Heitman, *Historical Register of Officers of the Continental Army*.

XII.

SUR LES HAUTEURS DE SPRING FIELD ce 21 juin 1780⁵⁴

J'ai l'honneur de vous envoyer, Monsieur le chevalier, deux lettres que je vous prie de cacheter et de faire ensuite parvenir au Cap Henry;⁵⁵ Vous y verrez le peu d'informations que j'ai pu me procurer, et le parti que le General Washington propose aux Generaux françois. J'envoie des lettres à peu près pareilles à Rhode island, mais avec cette difference que si la flotte atteri à cette isle, on lui conseille d'y attendre les nouvelles que je m'empresserai de donner. Dans tous les cas, Monsieur le chevalier, nous esperons en savoir assés dans deux jours pour fixer definitivement les premiers mouvements de l'escadre et des troupes françoises. Je vous ferai passer sur le champ mes premieres lettres pour le Cap Henry.

Ne sachant pas encore ou se porteront les efforts de l'ennemi, nous ne perdons pas de vûe la Riviere du Nord. Deux Brigades se sont portées hier au soir de ce coté; deux autres Brigades ont pris cette nuit la même route. Celles de Maxwell et de Stark restent ici pour le present avec la Milice. Nous nous occupons de la transportation des baggages et magasins. Je suivrai demain le General Washington pour joindre le gros de l'armée, et sans nous trop ecarter du jersay, nous prendrons une position moins hors de portée pour le secours de Westpoint.

En vous priant de faire mille compliments à Mr. de Marbois, j'ai l'honneur de vous assurer, Monsieur le Chevalier, de la tendre Amitié que je vous ai voué pour la vie.

LAFAYETTE

Le General me charge de vous faire un million de Compliments.

L.F.

XIII.

AU CAMP DE RAMAPAUH le 30 juin 1780.⁵⁶

Le genre de vie que nous avons mené depuis trois semaines, Monsieur le chevalier, nos occupations, notre proximité de l'ennemi et le danger de garder avec nous des papiers importants, voilà les raisons qui ont mis de l'inexactitude dans ma correspondance avec vous. Je vous rendis compte dans ma dernière lettre des mouvements que nous allions faire vers la Riviere du Nord. Les Brigades de Connecticut sont à West Point, et après l'action ou commandoit le G'al Greene⁵⁷ et dont vous aurés appris en même tems que moi les details, notre petite armée s'est réunie aux environs de Pompton ou elle attendra une partie de ses recrues. Les ennemis paroissent avoir renoncé à de grands projets, et occupent un petit coin de terrain depuis la Riviere du Nord jusqu'à la sonde. L'avantage d'assembler des Milices contre eux ne vaudroit pas celui que nous perdrons en retardant les operations de l'état de Connecticut.

Je ne sais, Monsieur le chevalier, s'il est une de mes lettres qui ne vous soit pas parvenue, mais j'avoue que n'ayant pas pu garder les vôtres

⁵⁴ Fols. 126-126 v.

⁵⁵ Doubtless these letters were similar to the letter of May 19 to Rochambeau printed in Lafayette, *Mémoires*, I. 335. Cf. Washington to Lafayette, May 16, in Ford, *Writings*, VIII. 274.

⁵⁶ Fols. 133-133 v. Ramapough in New Jersey.

⁵⁷ This was the battle of Springfield, June 23, 1780. Cf. Greene to Washington, Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 506.

avec moi, j'ai cru devoir différer quelques jours à vous répondre sur le Canada;⁵⁸ j'ai lu ce que vous me mandiez au G^{al} Washington: l'idée d'asservir ce pays, et celle de le conquérir avec l'intention de le rendre sont également revoltantes; d'un autre côté l'affranchissement des Canadiens devient fort intéressant à la tranquillité des états unis. Mais le General Washington n'arrête pas ses vues sur ce projet; il n'en parle que comme d'une chose possible, et ce n'est pas même le plan dont il est dans ce moment occupé. La délivrance des états unis me paroît être le premier objet, et je conviens que si nous avons les moyens suffisants pour y réussir, cet avantage sera le plus agréable de tous pour la France et pour l'Amérique.

J'ai reçu, Monsieur le chevalier, une lettre de Mr. Holker où il me fait quelques questions auxquelles je crois que Mr. de Corny vous a répondu par une lettre de Morristown. Quant à ses autres demandes, les projets de détail de Mr. de Corny ne me sont pas parfaitement connus et je crois que vous ferez bien de décider sur ces articles; car il faudroit du tems avant de recevoir une réponse de la Providence.⁵⁹

Mr. de Corny vous aura mandé, Monsieur, que le general desiroit que les waggon se portassent du côté de la Rivière de Connecticut. Vos emplettes me paroissent aller fort vite, et vous pourrez regarder ces achats sans argent comme une opération magique dans le tems présent. Vous vous rappelez, Monsieur le chevalier, que vous me chargeates d'arrêter les mesures que nous avions fait entreprendre au General Greene, et que ce changement n'a pu se faire assés tôt pour qu'il n'y eut pas déjà quelque chose de commencé. Il m'a montré une lettre de Mr. Mitchell concernant quelques waggon couverts auxquels se bornera son Memoire, et j'ai l'honneur de vous en envoyer la copie parcequ'il me paroît juste de payer ce qu'il a dépensé pour nous, et que vos arrangements avec Mr. Mitchell rendront ce paiement plus facile.

Le bruit de l'apparition d'une flotte française soit sur la côte de Louisbourg soit sur d'autres parties éloignées s'est naturellement répandu en Amérique, et remplira le but que vous vous proposiez lequel me paroît avantageux pour retenir les ennemis chés eux, et les tenir en suspens sur nos projets.

Les lettres de Boston, Monsieur le chevalier, confirment la nouvelle de la flotte et de l'armée espagnole;⁶⁰ je vous fais un million de remerciements d'avoir bien voulu m'en instruire.

Le nombre de troupes et de vaisseaux que nous avons dans les isles semble nous assurer les plus grands avantages. Si l'on en croit Mr. Revington lui même, il y a eu un engagement entre Mr. de Guichen et l'amiral Rodney où six vaisseaux anglois doublés en cuivre par un enchainement incroyable d'accidents plus facheux les uns que les autres *have been Mauled at an unmerciful Rate*. Mais après avoir perdu 180 hommes, ils s'en sont tiré fort honorablement, et l'armée angloise étoit en sûreté à quatre lieues *sous le vent* de la notre. En vérité, Monsieur le chevalier, il est permis de livrer son cœur au plus flatteuses esperances, et je compte bien fermement sur une brillante campagne.

Mais il nous manque ici des hommes, et les états n'en donnent pas

⁵⁸ Cf. *supra*, note 37.

⁵⁹ *I. e.*, from de Corny, who was now at Providence. Stone, *French Allies*, p. 192.

⁶⁰ Referring doubtless to the Spanish military force under Galvez which was operating against Florida.

autant que je voudrais. Nous n'avons même pas reçu toutes les réponses et comme la connaissance de nos forces doit décider les premières mesures à prendre dans le plan de la campagne, le General Washington veut savoir sur quoi compter avant que j'écrive les lettres promises à Mrs. les généraux français.⁶¹ J'espère cependant pouvoir leur donner de nos nouvelles aujourd'hui ou demain, et en envoyant ma lettre à Black point⁶² elle leur pourra parvenir à temps en cas que mes dernières dépêches du Cap Henry les aient déterminé à s'y rendre.

Le G^{al} Stark est envoyé à l'état de New Hampshire, et nous ne savons pas encore un mot de ce qu'ils feront.⁶³ Les personnes d'influence dans l'état de Massachusetts m'ont répondu des lettres fort détaillées mais se bornent à promettre trois mille neuf cent hommes que le G^{al} Glover a été recevoir.⁶⁴ L'état de Rhode Island fera, je crois, à peu près, ce qu'on leur demande, mais c'est une bien petite addition.⁶⁵ Connecticut avoit d'abord voté quinze cent hommes, nombre fort au dessous de leur quota; mais le G^{al} Parsons⁶⁶ qui y a été envoyé me mande qu'ils iront peut être à deux mille cinq cent qui ne sont pas encore suffisants. New York avoit malentendu la demande, mais j'espère que leurs quatre régiments seront plus complets que les autres. L'état de Jersey paroît assés bien disposé, mais leurs recrues ne sont pas arrivées. La Pensilvanie fait moins que tous les autres,⁶⁷ et le Maryland offre de donner un Régiment au lieu de la Milice, ce qui n'est peut être pas désavantageux si ce Régiment est composé des premiers hommes qu'ils auront et s'il arrive tout de suite.⁶⁸

En recevant hier votre lettre, Monsieur le chevalier, j'ai examiné le dernier état de situation de l'armée, et je suis fâché d'avouer qu'on ne vous a pas parlé avec franchise. Mais j'aime mieux que ce soit la faute des particuliers que celle des états, et je vais vous dire exactement notre situation relativement aux deux principaux objets. Massachusetts a seize Régiments dont le total ne montent à présent, tout compté, qu'à 1804 hommes. Les Régiments devant être de 504, vous voyez que leur

⁶¹ Cf. Washington to Committee of Co-operation, June 19, in Ford, *Writings*, VIII. 316. See also Luzerne to Congress, June 18, in Wharton, III. 803, and resolution of Congress of June 21, in *Journals*.

⁶² Cf. *supra*, note 55. Black Point is on the Connecticut shore, west of New London.

⁶³ See General Stark's instructions in Washington to Stark, June 30, Sparks's *Writings*, VII. 97; cf. Washington to Weare, June 30, *ibid.*, p. 96. See also Stark to Washington, July 13, in Sparks, *Letters to Washington*, III. 13.

⁶⁴ Brigadier-general John Glover of Massachusetts.

⁶⁵ Cf. Heath to Washington, June 21, *Heath Papers*, p. 74; "The General Assembly of this State [R. I.] have passed a resolve to raise the number of men required to complete their battalions".

⁶⁶ Brigadier-general Samuel H. Parsons of Connecticut; see his letter of June 24 in Hall, *Life and Letters of Parsons*.

⁶⁷ Cf. Reed to Washington, July 15, Sparks, *Letters to Washington*, III. 15; same to President of Congress, July 17, *Penn. Archives*, first series, VIII.; report of committee of Congress, *Journals*, July 26.

⁶⁸ Cf. Jenifer and Beall to Washington, June 22, Sparks, *Letters to Washington*, III. 3. On the general subject of the quotas, especially the efforts of Luzerne to have the army brought up to its full strength, cf. Luzerne to the President of Congress, June 18, Wharton, III. 803, and the resolves of Congress of June 21, *Journals*. Cf. Washington to Committee of Co-operation, August 17, in Ford, *Writings*, VIII. 383.

quota est de 8064, que par conséquent ils doivent 6260 pour lesquels on donne non plus 5000 mais environ 3900 hommes.

La pensilvanie a 10 Regiments dont le total se monte à present à 2153; leur quota est 5040, donc ils doivent 2887 dont mille ou douze cent hommes *ne forment pas la Majeure partie*. Dans cet état-ci, je ne fais aucune mention d'un onzieme Regiment qui est au fort pitt.

En vous envoyant ce detail si particulier, Monsieur le chevalier, je vous prie de considerer que j'en fais part plus à mon ami qu'au Ministre du Roy, qu'il ne doit pas affecter vos idées comme homme public, et je ne doute pas que vous n'en usiés avec reserve vis à vis les personnes qu'il interesse, en leur disant cependant qu'ils sont infiniment loin de leur quota, et que mille n'est pas la Majeure partie de trois mille.

Le president Reed, Monsieur le chevalier, craint de perdre sa popularité par des mesures vigoureuses, et useroit de ses pouvoirs avec energie si l'on pouvait lui faire voir que sa mollesse irritera contre lui le peuple, et qu'elle l'empêchera d'être choisi à la premiere election. Il a d'ailleurs beaucoup de vanité, et l'esperance d'être connu en france; l'assurance que non seulement les efforts de l'amerique, mais ceux de chaque etat auront un droit particulier à la reconnoissance des français pourroient peutêtre le determiner; la seule lettre precise que nous avons receu de lui nous annonce cinquante hommes. C'est à vous, Monsieur le chevalier, à le mettre en mouvement, et si vous pouvés lui faire remplir son quota à 504 hommes par Regiment, si l'etat de Mashashuset veut se mettre en frais, alors nos projets seront bien plus interessants que ceux du Canada, et nous ne penserons qu'à cet objet sur lequel les vœux de tout le monde doivent se réunir.

A propos du Canada, Monsieur le chevalier, comme nous ne nous en occupons pas à present, je vais y envoyer des personnes destinées à nous rapporter des nouvelles,⁶⁹ qui si elles sont prises serviront à donner le change aux ennemis. Je vous renvoie vos papiers aux armes de france, ma proclamation a été imprimée sur du papier commun.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier. Agréés, je vous prie, l'assurance du parfait et tendre attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'être,

Votre très humble et obeissant serviteur.

LAFAYETTE.

Mille compliments, je vous prie, à Monsieur de Marbois.

Mr. Wadsworth⁷⁰ m'écrit qu'il a fait un arrangement avec Mr. de Corny a Hartford pour la nourriture des chevaux de l'armée lorsqu'elle sera arrivée en Amerique.

P.s. Ce que vous m'avez mandé, Monsieur le chevalier, sur le *dollar dur* que l'on doit donner aux soldats me fait un bien grand plaisir. Ne laissés pas oublier ce bon projet; je voudrois que vous employés aussi votre influence à faire donner à chaque officier de l'armée ou un habillement en nature, ou ce qui vaudroit mieux encore une somme d'*argent dur* suffisante pour se vêtir deçemment. Mais il n'y auroit pas de tems à perdre, et ce seroit un grand coup.

L.F.

quand je parle du quota des etats, Monsieur le chevalier, je compte non pas d'après l'ancienne requisition du Congrès, mais d'après la demande nouvelle du Committé et du general ou l'on n'a point d'égard aux

⁶⁹ Cf. *infra*, note 73.

⁷⁰ Doubtless Jeremiah Wadsworth, former commissary general of purchases.

hommes dispersés pour je ne sais quel service public dans tous les coins du Continent. C'est des Bataillons à 504 qu'il nous faut. Le general a laissé au Congrès la decision du rappel de l'infanterie de Lee,⁷¹ mais il desire qu'elle se rejoigne ici à la Cavallerie, et je vous prie en mon particulier de nous la ravoir.

L.F.

XIV.

AU CAMP DE PRECANESS ce 4 juillet 1780.⁷²

Vous devés etre etonné, Monsieur le chevalier, de n'avoir pas encore reçu ma lettre pour Mrs. les generaux français, et je le suis moi même beaucoup des incertitudes qui occasionnent ce retard. Mais après avoir reçu des meilleurs pilotes les connoissances les plus precises sur le port de Newyork, lesquelles sont encore confirmées par les lettres de M. le c'te d'Estaing, je trouve un certain capitaine Davis homme fort estimé dans ce païs dont l'opinion ne paroît pas se rapporter à celle des autres. Le General Washington n'en est pas moins surpris que moi, et nous avons envoyé chercher les plus fameux pilotes du port pour les faire causer ensemble devant nous, et fixer enfin nos idees d'une maniere invariable. Nous serons encore plus en etat de donner des intelligences precises sur les vaisseaux et la garnison de Newyork, et comme j'enverrai sur le champ une copie de ma lettre à portée de Black point, elle y arrivera surement avant que mes dernieres depêches au Cap henry aient pu porter Mr. de Ternay devant Newyork.

Mes deux espions de Canada sont partis cette nuit, et j'ai l'honneur de vous envoyer copie de leur instructions. Comme ils prendront un petit parti avec eux, ils tâcheront en cas de malheur de reclamer le caractere d'officiers. Vous verrez, Monsieur le chevalier, que je prends toutes les precautions possibles pour engager les Canadiens a rester tranquilles jusqu'au moment ou nous voudrions les porter à se decider en notre faveur. J'ai fait à mes deux envoyés les plus fortes representations à cet egard, et leur ai même defendu de ramener personne. Je vous prie de vouloir bien me mander votre opinion et me renvoyer les instructions ci-jointes.⁷³

Permettés moi, Monsieur le chevalier, de vous presenter une idée, dont je n'ai pas parlé au G'al Washington, et dont vous jugerés mieux que moi la possibilité. Le C'l Laurens est prisonnier et le General qui voudroit l'avoir se fera un scrupule de delicatesse de l'echanger avant son tour. Comme les français ont beaucoup d'avance en officiers sur les

⁷¹ Washington wrote to the Board of War, on June 21, desiring that the infantry of Lee's corps be ordered to join the army; Fitzpatrick, *Calendar of Correspondence of George Washington with the Continental Congress*. On June 29 Congress ordered that the Board of War comply with the request; *Journals*.

⁷² Fols. 134-135. Preakness, N. J.

⁷³ The two agents were Captain Clement Gosselin and Lieutenant Anable Boileau, both of the 2d Canadian (Hazen's) Regiment. A copy of their instructions, dated at Preakness, July 1, is with the present letters, fols. 175-177. In general their mission was to secure information respecting the forces of the enemy in Canada and of the Canadian militia, the attitude of the Canadians, the resources of the country, fortifications, artillery, etc. Gosselin was to deal with Quebec and surrounding country, Boileau with Montreal.

ennemis, seroit-il hors de propos que vous tâchiés de tirer le malheureux Laurens de sa Captivité?⁷⁴

Nos recrues ne viennent pas, Monsieur le chevalier; on dit cependant que l'on se met en marche, mais j'ai grande envie de les voir en personne pour savoir sur quoi nous devons compter.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, voulés vous bien faire mille compliments à Mr. de Marbois, et compter sur le tendre et sincere attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'être Votre tres humble et obeissant serviteur

LAFAYETTE.

XV.

PREAKANESS ce 10 juillet 1780⁷⁵

Vous devés etre bien etonné, Monsieur le chevalier, de n'avoir pas encore reçu ma lettre annoncée pour le Cap henry. Mais le General eseroit que les nouvelles des etats le mettroient à portée de former un jugement plus sur; nous avons eu d'ailleurs une inquisition à etablir sur laquelle nous ne comptons pas. Le rapport de tous les marins, les assurances des meilleurs pilotes, l'opinion de toute l'amerique avoient fixé nos idées sur le port de Newyork, mais à force d'examiner et de comparer nous sommes parvenus à découvrir que les notions de tout le public et de chaque particulier n'étoient pas exactement justes. Ce n'est pas sans peine Monsieur le chevalier, que nous avons presque deviné et ensuite déterminé d'une maniere sûre les connoissances dont je fais part à Mr. de Ternay et qui le mettront à portée de decider s'il se croit en etat de posséder le port.

Vous verrés par la lettre ci-jointe⁷⁶ que dans le cas ou Mr. de Ternay peut entrer en dedans *du hook* et n'y craint pas des forces superieures, le General Washington est entierement décidé pour Newyork. Quant a moi, Monsieur le chevalier, je pense que le port étant à nous il y a tout lieu d'esperer que nous reüssirons. Cette place est sans comparaison la plus importante et si notre escadre est trop faible pour occuper son poste, il est egalement impossible de songer à Hallifax, Charlestown ou Savahana.

Après avoir examiné ma lettre, Monsieur le chevalier, je vous prie de vouloir bien l'envoyer en toute diligence; il est de la plus haute importance que votre chaine d'exprés ne perde pas une minute; si le tems d'avoir un exprés vous laisse celui d'en prendre copie, je vous prierai de l'envoyer chiffrée à Monsieur le c'te de Vergennes en même tems que vos autres dépêches. Pardon, Monsieur le chevalier, de toute les peines que je vous donne.

Par un bâtiment marchand arrivé dans l'est on apprend que notre flotte a mis à la voile au commencement de May. D'après le calcul des calmes et des vents mols de cette saison il est à croire qu'elle atterira au Cap henry, et, en y mettant de la diligence, qu'elle y recevra cette dernière lettre; dans tous les cas, celle que je vous ai envoyée avant celle-ci les aura portés sur *Black point* ou je fais passer un duplicata de nos propositions. Comme il est possible qu'avec une force inferieure Mr. le

⁷⁴ Cf. *Journals*, July 10, 1780: "Resolved . . . that the Board of War do take the most speedy measures for the exchange of Lieutenant Colonel John Laurens . . .". Laurens had been made a prisoner at Charleston. On December 23, 1780, he was appointed minister to France.

⁷⁵ Fols. 147-148 v.

⁷⁶ Cf. *supra*, notes 55 and 62.

chev. de Ternay s'établisse dans le port, comme il est probable qu'il aura plus de vaisseaux qu'on n'annonce, (et peut-être Mr. du Chaffaut⁷⁷ viendra-t-il lui même sous prétexte de convoyer), comme enfin l'amiral Graves peut n'être qu'un epouvantail, le G'al Washington desire, Monsieur le chevalier, que tout ce qui n' a pas été envoyé sur la Riviere du Nord reste quelque tems à Philadelphie, ou aux environs, mais hors de portée de notre communication. Dès que la flotte paraîtra, l'on vous enverra un courier, et vous pourrés faire passer par terre ou faire convoyer par l'Hermione à Sandy hook les articles destinés à l'armée.

Il est impossible, Monsieur le chevalier, de faire à l'avance des preparatifs dans le Jersey qui indiqueroient nos intentions. Mais nous tâcherons de fournir ce qui dependra de nous et cela joint aux végetaux, aux bestiaux etca., etca., que sous un autre prétexte vous pourrés rassembler en pensilvanie, suffira, je crois, complètement aux besoins de l'armée française jusqu'au moment de notre jonction. En écrivant à Mr. de Corny, je lui ai conseillé de revenir ici lorsqu'il auroit fini ses arrangements.

Je joins ici, Monsieur le chevalier. plusieurs lettres que je vous prie de vouloir bien faire remettre. Celles du g'al Schuyller sont très pressées et contiennent des demandes relatives a la cooperation.⁷⁸

Permettés moi, Monsieur le chevalier, de presenter ici mes compliments à Monsieur de Marbois, et de vous assurer du tendre attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'être, Votre très humble et obeissant serviteur

LAFAYETTE.

Dans les Batiments français en amerique auriés vous du Canon pour des Batteries flottantes? je le desirerois mais en doute fort.

XVI.

Ce 14 à 10 h'e ½⁷⁹

Je viens de recevoir une lettre, Monsieur le chevalier, qui m'apprend l'arrivé de la flotte à Rhode island. Elle etait du moins en vue le 10 à quatre heures du soir et l'on me promet qu'au moment de son entrée dans le port on me depêchera un second courier. Dès que cet exprés et les depêches des generaux français me seront parvenües je vous en donnerai avis avec toute diligence. J'aurai aussi l'honneur de vous mander ce que le G'al Washington desire au sujet des chariots chevaux etca.

On dit, mais non pas d'une maniere certaine, que la flotte consiste en douze vaisseaux de ligne.⁸⁰ Je n'ai que le tems de vous assurer de mon tendre attachement.

LAFAYETTE.

⁷⁷ Louis-Charles, comte du Chaffault de Besné, appointed lieutenant-general of the French navy in 1777.

⁷⁸ Note the letters of the Committee at Headquarters, of July 10, mentioned in Fitzpatrick, *Calendar*, pp. 437-438.

⁷⁹ Fol. 149.

⁸⁰ Cf. Heath to Washington, July 11, Sparks, *Letters to Washington*, III. 12: "The fleet consists of seven sail of the line;—the Duc de Burgogne, of eighty guns; Le Neptune and Le Conquérant of seventy-four; Le Jason, L'Eville, L'Ardent and Le Provence, of sixty-four; Le Fantasque, hospital ship, of sixty-four mounts forty guns; two frigates and two bombs, with about five thousand land forces and one thousand marines."

XVII.

CAMP, July the 16th [sic] 1780.⁸¹

J'ai tant de confiance en vos bontés, Monsieur le chevalier, que je prends la liberté de vous adresser une partie de mes baggages qui me deviennent inutiles pour la campagne. Oserai-je vous prier de vouloir bien ordonner qu'on les dépose chés vous (si cependant cet arrangement ne vous embarrasse pas) et en vous demandant un million de pardons pour la liberté que je prends, je ne me servirai pas d'un moyen si long pour vous mander des nouvelles, et je me contenterai de vous présenter l'hommage de mon tendre attachement

LAFAYETTE.

XVIII.

AU CAMP ce 19 juillet à 4 heures du matin.⁸²

Ce n'est qu'hier au soir, Monsieur le chevalier, que nous avons reçu le second exprès attendu de Rhode island, et je me presse de vous envoyer Mr. de Gimat pour vous porter vos lettres et vous donner toutes les informations que vous pouvez désirer. Mr. de Rochambeau écrit au général qu'il lui amène une avant garde laquelle sera bientôt suivie du reste des troupes, et l'assure de la part du Roy que Sa Majesté soutiendra cette opération-ci de tout son pouvoir.⁸³ Mr. du Chaffaut étoit en Rade à Brest et d'après le départ de Greaves, je ne doute pas qu'il n'escorte le second envoy; Mais je suis fâché qu'on parle hautement de ce projet parceque les ennemis feront des efforts pour intercepter ce qu'ils pourront. Nous avons à Rhode island cinq mille hommes et sept vaisseaux sans compter le vaisseau hôpital qui en fera un huitième.

En rendant compte au Général de la situation, Mr. de Rochambeau croit que ses troupes seront en état d'agir dans un mois à commencer du moment de leur arrivée. Je pars aujourd'hui pour Rhode island, et en même tems je tâcherai de me rendre utile aux troupes françaises je suis chargé par le général d'arranger définitivement le plan de campagne. Nous aurons vraisemblablement le renfort de France avant que nos alliés soient en état de quitter Rhode island.

Aussitôt que j'ai appris l'arrivée de Greaves avec six ou sept vaisseaux⁸⁴ je me suis pressé d'en donner avis, et comme notre projet étoit calculé sur la supposition que les Français avoient toutes leurs forces, et sur celle d'une supériorité maritime, je ne doute pas que l'Escadre et les troupes ayant rencontré Greaves en mer n'attendent à Rhode island les réponses à leurs lettres que je leur porterai en toute diligence.

Les Français et les Américains à Rhode island sont infiniment contents les uns des autres et tout ceci paroît prendre la meilleure tournure. L'intention du Gouvernement est de soutenir ceci avec vigueur.⁸⁵

⁸¹ Fol. 154.⁸² Fols. 156-157 v.⁸³ Rochambeau to Washington, July 12, in Doniol, V. 348. The "reste des troupes" constituted the second division so eagerly awaited by Lafayette, which was destined never to leave Brest; cf. Perkins, p. 312.⁸⁴ After having been delayed by storms, Graves sailed from England on May 15, with seven vessels, in pursuit of the French expedition. He arrived off Sandy Hook on July 13.⁸⁵ Cf. Heath to Washington, July 12: "for myself, I am charmed with the officers"; and July 16: "The [French] officers express the highest satisfaction at the treatment they meet with". Sparks, *Letters to Washington*, III. 12, 28; cf. also Perkins, pp. 306-309.

Le general Washington pense, Monsieur le chevalier, qu'on ne sauroit envoyer trop promptement les waggons, chevaux etca. de l'armée française. Mr. de Gimat va vous offrir ses services, et en qualité d'officier Americain pourra vous devenir utile dans les directions que vous lui donnerés pour veiller à l'arrivée de ces differents articles sur la Riviere du Nord, et les expedier de là pour Rhode island. Je lui ai recommandé d'y mettre toute la diligence possible, et pense que nous rendrons un grand service aux français en leur procurant bien vite tout ce dont ils ont besoin.

Mr. de Rochambeau mande que d'après sa position à Rhode island pour soutenir la flotte il ne craint rien pour elle, et se trouve dans une situation respectable.⁸⁶

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, tout ira bien, et puisqu'on nous soutient j'espere que nous seront en etat de porter le grand coup. Agrées, je vous prie, l'assurance de mon tendre attachement.

LAFAYETTE.

Mille compliments, je vous prie, à Mr. de Marbois, dites lui que Mr. de Charlus est ici.

Aussitot que je scus l'arrivée de Greaves je vous le fis dire par le docteur Cochran [?]⁸⁷ et j'attendois pour ecrire le compte que devoient rendre nos postes du jersay que nous n'avons pas receu, je ne sais par quel accident.

L.

XIX.

AU CAMP PRES DOB'S FERRY 8 aoust 1780.⁸⁸

Me voici revenu, Monsieur le Chevalier, et la marche du General sur New York ne m'a pas permis de rester à Rhode Island, mais avant de partir j'ai laissé l'armée française etablie de maniere à ne rien craindre; d'après les dispositions de Mrs. de Rochambeau et de Ternay jointes au zeile de la milice lequel a beaucoup surpassé ce qu'ils auroient fait pour secourir leurs propres troupes, nous avions, Monsieur le chevalier, de bonnes raisons pour desirer une visite de M. Clinton. Pendant ce tems la notre armée auroit attaqué Newyork, et je serois, j'espere, arrivé assés tôt pour en avoir ma part.

L'armée française est un des [plus] beaux Corps de troupes qu'on

⁸⁶ See Rochambeau to Washington, July 12, in Doniol, V. 348-349.

⁸⁷ Dr. John Cochran of Pennsylvania, at this time physician and surgeon general of the Middle Department. Heitman, p. 162.

⁸⁸ Fols. 158-159 v., L. S.; the postscript is autograph. Since writing the preceding letter Lafayette had visited Newport to confer with Rochambeau and de Ternay; see his instructions from Washington of July 15 in Tower, II. 127. He arrived at Newport on July 24, and found the French fleet blockaded by an English force under Arbuthnot, while Clinton was threatening a land attack from New York. The promptness of the French in establishing themselves on Rhode Island, the action of Heath in coming to the rescue, calling out Rhode Island and Massachusetts militia, and the rapid march of Washington toward New York averted the threatened attack. Lafayette's conference with Rochambeau and de Ternay was for the purpose of settling upon a plan of campaign. The negotiations are summed up by Lafayette in his letter to the French commanders of August 9, printed in *Mémoires*, I. 345. For a general account of Lafayette's mission to Newport see Tower, II. 126-143; cf. Lafayette, *Mémoires*, I. 345, note 1; also Heath to Washington, July 25, 26, 31, in Sparks, *Letters to Washington*, III.

puisse voir; leur discipline est admirable et les torys eux mêmes n'ont pû rien trouver à dire à ce sujet. M. de Rochambeau, tous les officiers, et même les Soldats de son armée sont dans les meilleures dispositions, et je ne doute pas qu'il ne regne la plus grande harmonie entre ces deux nations.

L'amour propre national ne peut qu'être choqué de voir Arbutnot bloquer insolemment le Port. Les Sentimens du peuple que j'ai sondés sur mon chemin, et leur impatience de nous voir superieurs me font encore plus vivement desirer un renfort de vaisseaux. Clinton n'attaquera pas Rhode Island, mais la seconde division court des risques, et d'ailleurs vous savez comme moi qu'il est bien necessaire d'operer cette campagne.

Mr. de Ternay a deja ecrit pour cinq vaisseaux des Isles et est autorisé par M. de Sartine à les demander; mais je ne sais si M. de Guichen a son chiffre, et lui ai proposé de faire passer les lettres par votre moyen. S'il m'est permis de donner icy mon opinion Monsieur le Chevalier, je crois qu'une lettre pressante de vous auroit un excellent effet, j'ai pris encore sur moi d'ecrire à cet amiral, et vous supplie de vouloir bien envoyer mon epitre avec la votre et celle de M. de Ternay.⁸⁹ Vous ecrirés, je pense par triplicata, et vous avés dû savoir la destination des flottes combinées; j'imagine donc que nos lettres trouveront M. de Guichen à la J——⁹⁰ et il est bien essentiel que le secours nous arrive avant le 15 de septembre.

J'aurai l'honneur de vous communiquer Monsieur le Chevalier, un precis de mes conversations avec les Generaux français,⁹¹ mais je ne veux pas retarder un instant l'envoy de la lettre à Mr. de Guichen; vous verrés que sans la superiorité maritime on ne croit pas pouvoir agir, et que si nous ne l'avons pas dans les premiers jours de Septembre les efforts de l'amerique se trouveront n'avoir rien produit, et nous retomberons à l'ancien point ou nous etions.

M. de Rochambeau m'avoit chargé d'une lettre pour vous, et d'une lettre pour le President du Congrès;⁹² je devois les communiquer au G'al Washington, mais elles ont été données par etourderie a M. Matheus⁹³ qui vous les a fait passer sur le champ; les Français sont très empressés de recevoir tous les articles achetés pour eux. Leur intendant a fait de nouveaux marchés, et tous ses arrangements sont pris d'apres les notions europeennes. Ils ont de la viande mais manquent de vegetables.

Agreés je vous prie, Monsieur le Chevalier, l'assurance du tendre et sincere attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'être

Votre très humble
et obeissant Serviteur

LAFAYETTE.

⁸⁹ De Ternay to Washington, August 10: "The Marquis de Lafayette would send, by this opportunity, the letter which I had transmitted to him for the Count de Guichen, and which ought to be translated into ciphers by the Chevalier de la Luzerne. I require, conformably to the orders of the King, a reinforcement of some ships from this French Commander". Sparks, *Letters to Washington*, III, 58; cf. Washington to de Guichen, September 12, Sparks, *Writings of Washington*, VII, 195.

⁹⁰ Jamaïque.

⁹¹ See *infra*, note 95.

⁹² Rochambeau to Luzerne, August 4; same to President of Congress, August 3, both in Doniol, V. 352-354. Cf. report of committee on letter of Rochambeau, in *Journals*, August 17, 1780.

⁹³ Doubtless John Mathews of South Carolina, a member of Congress and of the Committee at Headquarters.

Oserai-je vous prier de faire mille compliments à Mr. de Marbois. J'ai enfin trouvé moyen de vous épargner quelquefois le déchiffrement de mon griffonage; mais j'aime à vous dire moi même combien je vous suis tendrement attaché.

LF.

XX.

AU CAMP PRÈS TAPPAN ce II aoust 1780.⁹⁴

J'ai l'honneur, Monsieur le chevalier, de vous envoyer copie de ma lettre a Mms. de Rochambeau et de Ternay, elle vous mettra sous les yeux mes propositions, les reponses de ces Generaux, et les arrangements dont nous sommes convenus; d'après les ordres precis du G'al Washington, j'ai du leur dire notre situation actuelle, et l'etat de faiblesse ou nous serons au mois de janvier. Mais en pesant sur les raisons qui exigent une immediate cooperation, j'ai taché de detruire les fausses idées de ces messieurs sur quelques points, et s'ils envoient copie de ma lettre avec les duplicatas de la leur, on y pourra retrouver les mêmes expressions mais en ordre renversé, car j'avoüe que je ne suis pas de leur avis sur bien des articles.⁹⁵

Ces messieurs croient que l'amerique leur sera très obligée de servir de garnison à Rhode island, et vous savés que nous ne faisons cas de cette isle que dans son rapport avec les secours qui peuvent arriver de france. Ils croient qu'il est egal d'operer cette campagne ou l'année prochaine, et que l'amerique ne demandera pas mieux que de faire de nouveaux efforts au printemps, ils pensent qu'il est indifferent que la plus grande proportion de troupes soit française ou Americaine, et s'ils pouvaient avoir quinze ou vingt mille hommes ici ils croient pouvoir sans inconvenient les joindre aux six ou sept mille Americains qui resteroient. Ils ne sont pas assés convaincus que les secours de l'amerique, et particulierement ceux de notre armée leur sont necessaires pour agir dans ce pais-ci. Ils prennent enfin pour le sentiment de l'amerique ce que cinq ou six habitants de Newyork [Newport?] peuvent leur dire en dinant avec eux. Ces idées, Monsieur le chevalier, etoient toutes renfermées dans la lettre dont Mr. de Gimat m'a parlé. Je la connoissois déjà, mais on ne peut rien faire sur ce qui est passé; je me suis contenté de dire à ces messieurs ce dont vous voyes ici l'abregé, d'ailleurs on me regarde trop comme Americain pour ne pas me soupçonner de partialité, et c'est vous, Monsieur le chevalier, qui devés combattre les opinions de Mr. de Valnais et Compagnie.

J'ai passé à travers beaucoup de pais, et vous savés que parmi le peuple d'amerique on ne me regarde aucunement comme etranger. J'ai donc été à portee de voir l'ent. qu'on etoit fort inquiet sur la Seconde division, 2^e ent. qu'il etoit politiquement necessaire d'agir cette campagne 3^e ent. que les torys repandoient que cette promesse d'une pretendue seconde division etoit un trait d'adresse de la france, 4^e ent. que l'on tâche de persuader à tous les Wiggs que la politique de la france est de prolonger la guerre. D'après ces observations, Monsieur le chevalier, je n'aime pas que Mr. de Rochambeau paroît si attaché à ce poste de Rhode island, et semble ne songer qu'à la campagne prochaine. Une autre

⁹⁴ Fols. 160-162 v.

⁹⁵ Lafayette's letter to Rochambeau and de Ternay, of August 9, is printed in Tower, II. 143-149, and in *Mémoires*, I. 345-357. For a general account of the discussion over the proper military policy, cf. Perkins, pp. 310-313.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XX.—24.

chose qui m'a humilié; c'est que Mr. de Ternay ait refusé *dans tous les cas* de forcer le port de Newyork, et j'ai un peu changé la construction du compte que j'ai rendu à ce sujet. Cette lettre-ci, monsieur le chevalier, ne doit être qu'entre vous, Mr. de Marbois et moi, et je vous y parle avec toute la franchise de l'amitié. J'ai cru entrevoir que les généraux n'étoient pas pressés d'agir avant qu'une augmentation de forces ne leur donnât de plus grand moyens à leur disposition, et que jusques là, on ne vouloit pas compromettre le peu qui est ici.

Je ne suis pas content de Mr. de Ternay: il n'est aimé ni de la mer ni de la terre; Mr. de Rochambeau est au contraire chéri de l'un et de l'autre. Vous connoissés le caractère, l'esprit, et les talents de ces deux généraux, ainsi je n'ai rien à vous apprendre sur eux. Je desire que Mr. de Rochambeau ait de bons Memoires et qu'il soit convaincu de la nécessité d'agir le plutôt possible; je desire aussi qu'il écrive peu lui-même aux gouverneurs des Etats, qu'il n'ait jamais affaire qu'au G'al Washington; qu'il ne donne d'ordres qu'aux français, et n'en reçoive que du G'al Washington, qu'il soit bien persuadé de la preeminence du pouvoir civil sur le pouvoir militaire. Vous savés combien son ame est honnête et portée au bien; il est très disposé à tout concilier, et je crois que votre correspondance avec lui produira le meilleur effet.

Les deux généraux de terre et de mer s'accordent parfaitement et la raison en est que Mr. de Rochambeau cede toujours à Mr. de Ternay; aux deux chefs prés, la terre et la Marine ne s'aiment pas mieux qu'à l'ordinaire.

La discipline de l'armée e[s]t comme je vous l'ai mandé au-dessus de tout éloge; tous les officiers et soldats sont disposés à entretenir une bonne harmonie avec les Americains, mais leur inaction leur donne beaucoup d'humeur, et les gens de la Cour particulièrement se plaignent d'avoir été envoyés pour garder des vaisseaux, ou pour garder une isle dont personne en Amerique ne se soucie.

Je le repete encore, Monsieur le chevalier, il est bien important que nous puissions agir avant la fin de cette campagne. J'attends avec bien de l'impatience l'annonce de la seconde division ou un secours de Mr. de Guichen. Si la superiorité maritime nous arrive avant le quinze septembre, l'objet ne doit pas être douteux. Si elle arrive plus tard la Georgie et la Caroline desirent nous occuper, et il est, je crois, utile que vous convainqués d'avance les généraux français de cette vérité militaire et politique.

Nous sommes ici, Monsieur le chevalier, fort à portée des ennemis, et ma division legere est trois mille en avant de l'armée. Si Clinton veut se battre, et s'il est battu, ce seroit répondre à beaucoup d'objections sur l'expédition de New York.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, cette lettre-ci est trop intimement particuliere pour que je ne la finisse pas simplement en vous assurant de ma tendre amitié.

LAFAYETTE.

Oserai-je vous demander si vous avés quelque bien bonne occasion pour écrire en France. Il n'y en a point de sûre a Newport, et le Blocus rend la chose difficile.

Ne pensés vous qu'il seroit à propos d'envoyer sous votre chiffre au Ministre une copie de la lettre ci-jointe?

XXI.

AU CAMP DE L'INFANTERIE LEGERE ce 15 aoust.⁹⁶

Rien de nouveau, Monsieur le chevalier, et nous n'entendons aucunement parler de la seconde division. J'ai peur qu'il n'y ait eu de nouveaux retards, et toutes les fois qu'on m'en demande des nouvelles, j'avoie que j'éprouve une véritable souffrance. Dès que vous saurés quelque chose dont vous puissiez tirer quelque vraisemblance, je vous conjure de m'envoyer sur le champ un courier, et vous en promets autant de mon côté.

On dit que Clinton prepare un embarquement, et que deux mille hommes ont reçu ordre de s'y disposer. Est-ce une incursion dans le pays qu'ils projettent, ou bien envoient-ils des troupes au Canada ou à la Jamaïque dont il paroît qu'ils connoissent à présent le danger ou du moins le plan d'attaque réglé entre les Cours de France et d'Espagne.⁹⁷ Quelques personnes disent que les ennemis tirent des troupes de Charles town, et se borneront à garrisonner cette place, que nous nous bornerons à prendre si la seconde division arrive trop tard. J'ai vu hier le fort Washington, et vous assure que ce n'est point un ouvrage bien terrible. Je n'ai reçu aucune lettre de Rhode island. Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, Agréés je vous prie l'assurance de mon tendre attachement.

LAFAYETTE.

Voulés vous bien faire mille compliments à Mr. de Marbois. Vous devriés bien conseiller au Congrès de répondre poliment à notre épitre.

LE.

XXII.

AU CAMP DE LA DIVISION LEGERE ce 18 aoust 1780.⁹⁸

A moins que le sort ne s'en mêle, Monsieur le chevalier, j'espère que vous n'aurez pas désapprouvé ma lettre aux Généraux français,⁹⁹ et si j'ai mis par écrit nos conversations si j'ai hasardé quelques opinions politiques, vous aurés deviné sans peine que dans le premier cas je suivais les ordres, et dans le second le sentiment du General Washington. Les lettres que je joins ici¹⁰⁰ vous montreront qu'on n'est pas content de moi, et celles de mes amis particuliers m'assurent qu'on n'aime ni mes conversations par écrit ni ma politique, et qu'on me soupçonne en vertu d'un sentiment antipatriotique de déprecier dans ce pays les secours et l'amitié de la France. Tout cela ne laissera pas que de vous paroître extraordinaire.

Vous verrez par mes réponses¹⁰¹ que sans avoir tort je demande pardon; je me mettrai même à genoux si l'on veut et je crois que je me laisserai battre; je n'ai pu cependant m'empêcher de faire sentir qu'on se trompoit un peu, et si vraiment vous croiés que mes actions, mes idées et mes paroles peuvent s'allier avec quelque espèce de patriotisme, je

⁹⁶ Fols. 164-164 v. The corps of light infantry was formed by Washington on August 1, and its command given to Lafayette, who joined it on August 7. Its camp was in advance of the main army, whose headquarters on August 16 were at Orangetown. See Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 135, note, and 153.

⁹⁷ Cf. Doniol, IV. 352, 353.

⁹⁸ Fols. 165-166 v.

⁹⁹ I. e., letter of August 9, referred to in note 95.

¹⁰⁰ Referring doubtless to his letter from Rochambeau of August 12, printed in *Mémoires*, I. 357; Doniol, V. 363; Tower, II. 151.

¹⁰¹ Lafayette to Rochambeau and de Ternay, August 18, *Mémoires*, I. 359; same to Rochambeau, August 18, *ibid.*, p. 362; Tower, II. 153.

vous prie de vouloir bien renforcer ma politique par la votre sans cependant faire mention de ma confiance. Quant à moi, je ne me mêlerai plus de politiques, et je suis si persuadé que la confiance et l'amitié de ces messieurs pour moi est nécessaire au bien de la chose, que je leur défie de se fâcher, car si je ne suis pas de leur avis, je fermerai la bouche.

Tout ceci, monsieur le chevalier, est plus écrit à mon ami qu'au Ministre du Roy. Je serais au desespoir de mander un mot qui put faire le moindre tort à ces messieurs, particulièrement à Versailles. D'ailleurs je suis bien loin de me plaindre d'eux; ils ne savent pas les peines que j'ai pu prendre pour faire valoir leur secours; ils ont imaginé que puisque je leur en mandois tant, j'en disais bien davantage aux Americains; tout cela est fort simple; vous en rirés, et moi, je me suis d'abords mis en colere, j'en rirai aussi à la fin, et je dirai toujours que c'est moi qui ai tort, mais que je n'y reviendrai plus. En attendant, Monsieur le chevalier, j'enrage des questions qu'on me fait sur la seconde division, des inquietudes et des propos que les torys tachent de nourrir, et je ne trouve pas ma position *douce* car je suis sur les épines. Quoique je deprecie les secours de france, n'allés pas me croire un tory.

Je crois, monsieur le chevalier, que les generaux français ont bien besoin d'être éclairés par vous, et ce n'est pas seulement pour ma justification que je desire les voir recevoir de vous les mêmes *paroles* que je leur ai dites.

Vous aurés appris ce que nous ne savons pas ici officiellement, mais ce que tout le monde mande de Boston au sujet de la flotte de Quebec. On dit qu'un vaisseau de 74 en a pris sept, les Corsaires americains 18, et que les sept autres seront pris par d'autres Corsaires croisant à l'entrée du fleuve St. Laurent.¹⁰²

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, Recevés, je vous prie, l'assurance du tendre attachement que mon coeur vous a voué.

LAFAYETTE.

Je vous prie de me renvoyer tous ces griffonnages.

XXIII.

AU CAMP DE L'INFANTERIE LEGERE ce 24 aoust 1780.¹⁰³

Bonnes nouvelles, Monsieur le chevalier, la seconde division arrive ou du moins nous avons bien droit de l'esperer. Je ne puis vous dire à quel point je suis heureux, et cependant je n'ose encore me livrer tout à fait à la joie. Un docteur arrive de New hampshire, le docteur a rencontré un ancien officier de notre armée, et plusieurs personnes dignes de foi lesquelles lui ont dit, qu'un jour ou deux apres l'Alliance, il est arrivé à Boston un Cutter français qui avoit la laissé, la seconde division, sous le convoy de huit vaisseaux de ligne à la hauteur des Bermudes, et qui venoit savoir dans quel port elle devoit entrer. On a sur le champ expédié deux batiments pour aller à leur rencontre. Quand je vous ai écrit ce matin, Monsieur le chevalier, j'avois le coeur serré de penser que cette seconde division n'étoit peut-être pas partie, mais à present c'est bien different, et je ne doute presque pas de sa prompte arrivée. Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, envoyés moi mes paquets, mandés moi des nouvelles, et permettés moi de vous embraser de tout mon coeur.

LAFAYETTE.

¹⁰² Cf. Washington to Heath, August 17, Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 155.

¹⁰³ Fols. 167-167 v.

XXIV.

AU QUARTIER GENERAL LIBERTY POLE ce 24 aoust 1780¹⁰⁴

Je m'empresse de vous apprendre, Monsieur le chevalier, que l'*Alliance*—cette fregatte tant désirée est enfin arrivée à Boston, et qu'elle a laissé le port de l'Orient le 6 juillet. Nous savons cette nouvelle par une lettre de Mr. de Rochambeau au general,¹⁰⁵ et par une gazette de Boston qu'il lui a envoyée. On dit que douze vaisseaux étoient bloqués dans le port de Brest par trente deux vaisseaux Anglois, mais que la flotte de Cadix montait à quarante vaisseaux de ligne. Rien de certain sur la seconde division; j'aurois désiré recevoir des lettres de Rhode island, mais n'ayant que la lettre officielle au G'al Washington, je ne puis vous mander que ce qu'elle contient. Il paroît cependant que toutes les dépêches vous sont adressées, et aussitôt qu'elles vous arriveront je vous supplie de me faire passer les miennes le plus promptement possible. Si vous m'adressés celles des generaux français, je crois pouvoir soit par la chaine, soit par un homme sûr, les faire arriver fort diligemment a Newport.

L'armée est au *liberty pole*: l'infanterie legere quatre milles en avant, un peu au dessous du fort *Washington*. Je pars cette après midi pour Bergen, et le G'al Greene s'avance avec une partie de l'aile droite pour me soutenir. L'ennemi n'a qu'à passer la Riviere pour nous attaquer, et je porterai une partie de l'avant garde jusques sur la chaussée de paulus hook. On croit qu'il y aura quelque chose à faire, au moins pour l'infanterie legere, mais j'avoue que je doute fort de voir notre Cartel accepté. Le but principal de ce mouvement est de fourrager toute cette partie. Nous manquons totalement de viande et il y a trois jours que l'armée souffre beaucoup, ce qui, (entre nous) s'attribue aux paiements en or et aux marchés sans restrictions faits par l'intendant de l'armée française.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, je n'ai que le tems de vous assurer de mon tendre attachement.

LAFAYETTE.

Mille compliments, je vous prie, a Monsieur de Marbois.

XXV.

AU CAMP DE LA DIVISION LEGERE ce 27 aoust 1780.¹⁰⁶

Me voici revenu, Monsieur le chevalier, dans mon Camp près du fort *Lee*, et le compte que je vous rendrai de nos operations ne vous paroitra gueres interessant. Notre fourrage sans etre considerable a cependant rapporté quelques bœufs et quelque nourriture pour nos chevaux. Nous avons pendant cette operation offert à l'ennemi un flanc aussi allongé que l'isle de New York, embarrassé de chariots, et formé seulement par l'aisle droite et l'infanterie legere laquelle a fourragé jusqu'au bras de mer qui separe Staten island, et a toujours tenu un Regiment à une portée de fusil des ouvrages de paulus hook. Je vous fais ce detail, Monsieur le chevalier, pour vous prouver combien les ennemis étoient peu disposés à repondre à nos avances. Il est vrai que malgré notre allongement le

¹⁰⁴ Fols. 170-171.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. James Bowdoin to Washington, August 17, 1780, in Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 60: "Yesterday arrived the frigate *Alliance*, forty days from L'Orient".

¹⁰⁶ Fols. 172-173.

general Washington avoit placé tous les corps de son armée de maniere à prevenir tous les cas de danger, et à rendre dans plusieurs autres une action fort desirable.

Mr. Capitaine [*sic*] a été chargé, Monsieur le chevalier, de vous écrire une apologie pour ma precipitation de l'autre jour. Mon cœur s'est laissé aller à la joie d'une nouvelle qui dans le premier instant me paroissoit sûre, et mon amitié pour vous m'ayant fait desirer que vous la partagiez sur le champ, je me suis trop pressé de vous la faire parvenir.

Nous sommes rentrés cette nuit à notre Camp près du fort Lee, et je reçois à l'instant un dragon de l'armée avec une lettre du G^{al} Washington.¹⁰⁷ Je m'empresse, Monsieur le chevalier, de vous l'envoyer; elle vous apprendra le peu de nouvelles que nous savons, et aussitôt que les dépêches seront arrivées on ira jour et nuit vous les porter.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, je vous embrasse de tout mon cœur, et espere que vous ne doutés pas de mes tendres sentiments pour vous.

Je vous prie de vouloir bien me renvoyer la lettre.

LAFAYETTE.

Mille compliments, je vous prie, à Mr. de Marbois. Vous devés etre d'autant plus sur de l'exactitude du paragraphe que Mr. de Rochambeau écrit toujours en anglois quoiqu'il ne l'entende pas.

L.F.

XXVI.

AU CAMP DE LA DIVISION LEGERE PRES HAKINSAC, Ce 10 7bre. 1780.¹⁰⁸

Il y a bien longtems, Monsieur le chevalier, que ja n'ai eü l'honneur de vous écrire; j'attendois à chaque minute les dépêches de l'Alliance, et sans pouvoir comprendre le retard des officiers chargés de nos lettres, je croiois de moment en moment voir arriver celui ou je vous enverrois des paquets de Versailles. Un de ces messieurs a paru enfin hier au soir; mais jugés de mon ettonnement quand j'ai appris qu'il n'avoit de dépêches publiques ni pour vous, ni pour moi, ni pour les generaux fran- çais. Mr. de Vauban¹⁰⁹ s'est présenté à M. Landais¹¹⁰ avec toutes les lettres ministerielles; il avoit même, assure-t-on, un ordre de M. de Sar- tine; toutes les nouvelles particulieres de fraiche datte etoient également en ses mains. Eh bien Mons. Landais n'a pas voulu de lui, et ses paquets ainsy que sa personne sont sur la côte europeenne.

L'Alliance ne nous porte que deux mille fusils, de la poudre et quant aux habits il n'y en a pas un seul à son bord. Paul Jones devoit suivre avec l'Ariel, mais il manquoit de matelots, et la fureur de croiser le retardera surement. D'ailleurs il ne peut point porter d'habillements, et

¹⁰⁷ This letter is not among the Washington Papers in the Library of Congress.

¹⁰⁸ Fols. 179-181 v., L. S.

¹⁰⁹ Comte de Vauban, aide-de-camp to Rochambeau. Balch, II. 244.

¹¹⁰ Pierre de Landais, former lieutenant in the French navy, later a captain in the navy of the United States, in command of the *Alliance*. In June 1780, the command of the *Alliance* having been given to Jones, by Franklin, Landais succeeded, at the instigation of Arthur Lee, in disaffecting the crew (Jones was absent in Paris) and sailed from L'Orient with Lee, but without the clothing and supplies which were to have been sent by the *Alliance*. During the voyage his conduct was so erratic that his officers took the command away from him. He was court-martialed and dismissed from the Navy. Allen, *Naval History of the American Revolution*, II. 482, 525.

nous ne les verrons qu'avec la seconde division. Le President du Congrès m'ayant envoyé quelques lettres arrivées par un vaisseau marchand, j'y ai trouvé une dépêche chiffrée de M. de Vergennes, et je m'empresse de vous en faire passer la copie; vous y verrez que le ministère n'étoit pas pressé d'envoyer la seconde division, mais que cependant nous devons l'espérer dans l'automne; vous y verrez qu'ils n'ont pas de notions fraîches sur les inconvenients actuels d'avoir ici tel ou tel nombre de troupes, lesquelles dans les circonstances presentes ma politique porteroit, mais aussi banneroit à huit ou neuf mille hommes effectifs. Vous y verrez qu'on attend beaucoup de nous et qu'on veut nous voir agir, mais on n'oublie pas, j'espere l'article maritime sans lequel vous savés qu'il n'y a pas d'esperance. Il seroit bien interessant, je crois, d'écrire bien tost au gouvernement et de demander des vaisseaux, de la poudre, quelques hommes, et avec la permission de Mr. Necker, de l'argent article essentiel.

L'officier arrivant de France dit qu'à son depart le Port de Brest étoit bloqué par 28 vaisseaux Anglois, que nous avions quatorze vaisseaux dans le port; que l'on en avoit rassemblé trente trois à Cadix que la seconde division convoyée par 3 ou 5 vaisseaux étoit prête, que depuis quelques jours les anglais croisoient fort au large. Je n'ai pas encore eû l'honneur de vous écrire sur la resolution prise par les états de l'Est et je n'ai pas besoin de vous dire le plaisir qu'elle m'a fait, mais vous savés que nous avons besoin d'être pressés, et j'espere que votre influence facilitera l'arrangement et en pressera l'exécution avant que nos recrues de six mois nous abandonnent. Il est bien important d'avoir une armée pour la guerre et ce dernier article qui ne peut s'obtenir que par *drafts* me paroît d'une nécessité absolue. Il ne l'est pas moins de prendre des mesures pour nourrir notre armée, qui vit du jour à la journée, qui manque à tous moments, qui au milieu d'un pays abondant éprouve le supplice de tantale, et qui sans magasins ne peut songer à aucune expedition éloignée; rendre au Congrès les pouvoirs dont il s'est dessaisi sans savoir pourquoi; y ajouter ceux sans lesquels les états seront desunis deux ans apres la paix; et former sur une base solide une étroite Confédération à laquelle je crois l'alliance française réunie, voila, Monsieur le Chevalier, quelles sont les intentions de quelques patriotes dans l'Est. Sans ces précieuses démarches, il n'y a point de salut pour nous, et je compte bien sur vous pour en déterminer et pour en hâter l'effet.

En consequence de la demande faite par les G^{aux} français, le G^{al} Washington s'est déterminé à quitter son armée et à leur proposer une entrevue à Hartford.¹¹¹ C'est le Vingt que nous y serons rendus, et il seroit, je crois, bien utile à la chose publique que vous puissiez quitter aussi votre residence. C'est pour cela que je m'empresse de vous faire part du tems de notre voyage, mais si vous n'y venés pas, Monsieur le chevalier, je desire bien que vous écriviez aux généraux français pour les déterminer vers le Sud, et que vous leur fassiez sentir que notre position n'est pas assez *douce* pour ne pas travailler à nous tirer au plus vite d'embaras. Si nous obtenons la superiorité maritime il me paroît que l'armée française a fait prendre icy des informations sur le Canada, mais quoique si nous n'allons pas au Sud, cette expedition sera la seule proposée et possible, j'aimerois bien mieux les carolines.

Il me paroît, Monsieur le Chevalier, que la vitesse du cheval de notre ami Gates n'a pas laissé que de nuire à la perfection de ses informations et si l'on en croit le Gouverneur Jefferson la fatale défaite due je pense

¹¹¹ Washington to Rochambeau, September 8, in Ford, *Writings*, VIII. 427.

au mauvais et anti-militaire ordre de la bataille, nous a cependant permis de sauver quelques troupes.¹¹² Je ne sais qui l'on enverra presentement en Caroline mais j'espere qu'on rapellera le G'al Gates et que l'armée combinée ira dans quelques mois reparer nos malheurs.

Quelques personnes disent, Monsieur le chevalier, qu'on va faire le G'al Washington dictateur. Je ne sais ni si comme son ami je dois le desirer pour lui, mais je sais tres certainement que je ne dois n'y en parler ni même avoir l'air de souhaiter cette mesure, laquelle cependant me paroît infiniment importante. D'apres ce que m'ont temoigné les ministres français je suis bien sure qu'ils seroient charmés d'avoir à traiter leurs operations avec le General. Quant à vous, Monsieur le chevalier, je n'ai pas besoin de vous demander ce que vous en pensés. C'est alors que la France preteroit l'argeant necessaire pour faire vivre, peut-etre pour payer l'armée et elle seroit sûre de voir ces emprunts bien employés etca., etca. Mes principes republicains et même entierement democratiques devoient me faire opposer à une pareille mesure aussi ne l'approuverois-je pas si je ne connoissois l'homme; et si je ne croiois pas le dictatortat necessaire au salut publique.

Quant aux nouvelles particulieres je vous dirai que la C'tesse Jules est accouchée d'un garçon, que Mr. le Prince de Condé est Colonel General de l'Infanterie, que Mr. le Prince de Montbarrey est grand d'Espagne (voila deux princes bien contents) que M. le Duc Dayen¹¹³ a la toison d'or, qu'on a fait une nuée de mestres de Camp (car c'est Mestre de Camp qu'on s'appelle à present), que tout Paris court apres Paul Jones, et que pendant ce tems-la nos habits restent sur la plage.

Adieu, Monsieur le Chevalier, agréés l'assurance du tendre attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'être

Votre tres humble
et obeissant serviteur

LAFAYETTE.

XXVII.

AU QUARTIER GENERAL Ce 17 Septembre 1780.¹¹⁴

Depuis quelque tems, Monsieur le chevalier, nous sommes livrés à toutes les vicissitudes d'esperance et de crainte. L'arrivée de Mr. de Guichen nous est annoncée de tant de cotés qu'il est difficile de ne pas y ajouter foi. Hier nous avons appris que l'amiral Rodney etoit arrivé devant Sandy hook avec treize vaisseaux,¹¹⁵ et que se joignant à Arbuthnot il allait ou attendre Mr. de Guichen ou de concert avec le G'al Clinton entreprendre contre Rhode island. Apres une nuit peu tranquille on me dit ce matin que les vaisseaux en question sont entrées dans le hook, et d'après cette nouvelle nous avons lieu d'esperer que le pretendu Rodney n'est que l'amiral Arbuthnot se cachant dans le port de Newyork. Si cela est ainsi, nous osons encore nous flatter que la grande expedition est possible.

Nous pouvons avoir environ douze mille continentaux; Mr. de Guichen a, dit-on, trois mille hommes; Mr. de Rochambeau, quatre. Nous rassemblerons dix mille miliciens. Quant aux provisions nous emploierons la

¹¹² Battle of Camden, August 16. See Jefferson to Washington, September 3, in Sparks, *Letters to Washington*, III. 73.

¹¹³ Lafayette's father-in-law.

¹¹⁴ Fols. 182-183 v.

¹¹⁵ Rodney arrived at New York on September 12.

force et pour une telle occasion le peuple ne le trouvera pas mauvais. S'il est possible à Mr. de Guichen de forcer le port de Newyork notre expedition est sure; s'il maintient la superiorité maritime hors du port, elle est encore possible. Voilà du moins mon opinion particuliere, mais le port est le point interessant.

Si notre pavillon regne ici et que New-York ne soit pas attaqué, il faut absolument aller au sud, et vous serez bien de mon avis. Nous partons à l'instant pour Hartford, ou nous verrons les generaux français. J'aurais bien voulu que vous y fussies non seulement pour avoir le plaisir de vous voir, mais pour des motifs de nature publique. Je n'ai pas receu de reponse à ce que j'avois l'honneur de vous mander à ce sujet. Le C^lel Tilmangh¹¹⁶ qui reste ici s'est chargé de me faire parvenir vos lettres en toute diligence. J'ai bien envie que ces messieurs connoissent par vous notre situation. Quoique un peu plus tranquille depuis ce matin, je suis encore bien inquiet sur cette nouvelle de Rodney. Si la jonction de nos escadres est faite, je serai au moins rassuré sur les malheurs. Mr. de Guichen sera egal, et, prejugués à part, je crois que delors il est superieur d'autant mieux qu'en cas d'evenement sa retraite est meilleure.

S'il y a la moindre nouvelle à ce sujet, j'ai charge le C^lel Tilmangh de vous ecrire sur le champ. Mr. de Pontgibault¹¹⁷ n'avoit pour vous qu'un paquet remis par un marchand, et qui lui a été peu recommandé; il l'a mis à la poste le lendemain de son arrivée, mais je ne l'en ai pas moins grondé. Les lettres des Ministres etoient dans les mains de Mr. de Vauban. Mais Landais a dit qu'il ne connoissoit pas ces Messieurs-là.

Oserois-je vous prier de dire à Mr. de Loyauté¹¹⁸ que si je ne lui reponds pas sur le champ, c'est pour tâcher de faire une reponse favorable, ce dont je doute bien vu nos circonstances. Mr. de Galvan¹¹⁹ est dans ma division legere et paroît content; je le suis infiniment de lui.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, agréés l'assurance de mon tendre attachement.

LAFAYETTE.

Mille compliments, je vous prie, à Mr. de Marbois

XXVIII.

AU CAMP PRÈS CRANESTOWN, ce 28 octobre 1780.¹²⁰

Ma lettre au G^{al} Washington, Monsieur le chevalier, est arrivée au quartier général au moment ou vous partiés, et auroit du lui parvenir

¹¹⁶ Tench Tilghman, of Pennsylvania, lieutenant-colonel, aide-de-camp and military secretary to General Washington. Heitman, p. 543.

¹¹⁷ Comte de Moré, chevalier de Pontgibaud, aide-de-camp to Lafayette. Balch, II. 202. See also the *Mémoires* of Pontgibaud.

¹¹⁸ Anne-Philippe-Dieudonné de Loyauté, inspector general of artillery and of fortifications in Virginia. Balch, II. 170.

¹¹⁹ De Galvan was a French volunteer officer, *ibid.*, 132.

¹²⁰ Fols. 190-191. Between September 17, the date of the preceding letter, and October 28, the date of this letter, the Hartford conference between Washington and Rochambeau had been held, September 20-22, and Arnold's treason had been discovered. For the Hartford conference see Doniol, IV. 404, where the proposals of Rochambeau and de Ternay are printed, together with Washington's replies. Lafayette's letter to Luzerne of September 25, containing an account of the Arnold affair, is printed in Tower, II. 164-168.

plutôt. Je doutois si peu qu'elle vous y trouvat que je n'ai pas cru devoir rien envoyer à Morris town. D'ailleurs ma piteuse aventure ne valoit pas la peine de vous ecrire.¹²¹

Tout nous favorisoit, Monsieur le chevalier, espions, guides, brouillard, tout étoit pour nous. Les troupes pleines d'ardeur et marchant avec le plus admirable silence étoient arrivées au moment précis. Mais un seul article ne dependoit ni d'elles ni de moi, et cet article a manqué par la bêtise ou la negligence du triste porteur de lunette l'ami Picquerin;¹²² les batteaux sont arrivés trop tard, et malgré les relais que par excès de precaution j'avois envoyé sur la route j'ai vu que le jour me viendrait dejouer avant mon arrivée aux ennemis, et qu'une surprise aisée se changeroit en un sanglant assaut ou je perdrois plus de braves soldats que je ne prendrais d'ennemis. J'ai donc resté tristement à Elizabeth town et suis revenu hier dans mon camp de Cranes town. A la maniere dont l'état Major de notre armée est arrangé, le general et ceux des officiers generaux qu'il honore de sa confiance ont quatre fois plus de peines et de petits details que dans les autres services, et finissent par manquer les operations par des contretems qui ne dependent pas d'eux.

Mr. Düer¹²³ de l'état de Newyork m'ayant écrit pour proposer aux français un marché de farine j'ai envoyé la lettre à Mr. de Rochambeau pour qu'il la soumette aux lumieres de Mr. Tarlet,¹²⁴ et qu'il fasse de la proposition ce qu'il jugera convenable. J'ai une lettre de Mr. de Marbois pour vous enfermée dans un portefeuille que je ne peux pas avoir à present et que je vous enverrai par la premiere occasion. Voulés vous bien lui faire mes compliments et lui montrer la copie de ma lettre au gouvernement.

Le Major Lee¹²⁵ va dans le sud; vous deviez bien conseiller au Congrès de lui donner une legion de deux cent chevaux et trois cent hommes d'infanterie. Elle sera de la plus grande utilité, et le Major Lee est sans comparaison le meilleur officier de troupes legeres qu'il y ait dans les armées Angloises, hessoises, ou americaines sur le Continent.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, Agrées l'assurance de mon tendre attachement.

LAFAYETTE.

Il y a dans les papiers de New York une dissertation sur l'alliance de la france avec l'amerique. Comme je voudrais que les ennemis en fissent souvent, car elle n'est pas brillamment raisonnée.

¹²¹ The "piteuse aventure" referred to in this and in the succeeding paragraph was the attempted attack on Staten Island by Lafayette's light infantry. Cf. Lafayette to Washington, October 30, in Tower, II. 172, and Washington to Lafayette, in Ford, *Writings*, IX. 17.

¹²² Timothy Pickering, at this time quartermaster general of the Continental Army.

¹²³ William Duer?

¹²⁴ De Tarlé was commissary in Rochambeau's staff. Balch, II. 235.

¹²⁵ Henry Lee—"Light Horse Harry".

(To be continued.)

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

Studies in Ancient Hindu Polity (based on the Arthasâstra of Kauṭilya). By NARENDA NATH LAW, M.A., B.L. With an introductory essay on the Age and Authenticity of the Arthasâstra of Kauṭilya by Professor RADHAKUMUD MOOKERJI, M.A. Volume I. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1914. Pp. xlv, 203.)

OUR knowledge of the internal affairs of Hindu government has until recently been based upon two sources, first the accounts given by the Greeks, notably by Megasthenes, second by the Hindu law-books and works of polity, *Nitiçâstra*, some of which go back to a period several centuries prior to the Christian era, but all of which are suspected of being rather ideal than practical. A few years ago the text of the *Arthaçâstra* was discovered. This work professes to be the composition of a certain Kautilya or Chānakya, the minister of Chandra Gupta, who reigned in the fourth century B. C. It appears to be, as Professor Mookerji calls it, "a unique record of the secular and practical activities and achievements of the Hindu genius", and as such is of peculiar interest.

Immediately on the appearance of the text a controversy arose among scholars in regard to its authenticity. In any event it was recognized as an important contribution to the subjects discussed in the law-books, such as the machinery of administration, courts of justice, laws of contract, sales, etc., especially as it treated of other matters scarcely touched upon in the formal *Dharmaçâstra*, such as the best method of handling live stock, keeping up means of communication, mining, irrigation, etc. But it was questioned whether this admittedly ancient treatise was really the work of Vishnugupta, Chānakya, or Kautilya, as its reputed author is variously named, or the work of a school based perhaps on the precepts of Kautilya but not actually from his hand.

In the introduction, Mr. Mookerji pleads for the former hypothesis, supporting the thesis of Professor Jacobi, as opposed to the latter hypothesis advocated by Professor Hillebrandt, who argues that the treatise is the work of a later school based on Kautilya's maxims. It does not appear to us that Professor Mookerji has proved his point. On the contrary, having ignored the evidence furnished by the law-books he has overlooked the fact that where the Kautilyan work agrees most closely with these books it agrees with the provisions of the later rather than with those of the earlier law. Moreover, the work itself recognizes the

later zenana system, which is not an early Hindu custom, and Professor Mookerji's citation from Aṣoka's Rock Edict, apparently recognizing this custom of keeping women housed in a harem, is of no avail, since the Rock Edict is not now so interpreted.

But the *Arthaśāstra* in any case is a mine of information concerning the administration of an ancient Hindu kingdom and that it reflects actual conditions may be seen from a comparison of the work with Megasthenes's notes and the life depicted in the Hindu epics. It tells how a king should live, describes his arduous days and nights, in which he examines accounts, studies, receives revenues, hears trials, discusses military affairs, etc. It explains the system of spies and government through minor officials; specifies the royal monopolies, salt, timber, horses, etc., the duties of the king in regard to widows and orphans, the duties of each overseer, of navigation, agriculture, forests, commerce, plays and gambling-halls, weights and measures; and gives details as to the collection of the census, the width of roads, breeds of horses, and even as to the milking of cows, the wages of cowherds, etc. Mr. Law's first volume treats of mining, irrigation, meteorology, live stock, game, forests, roads, works of public utility, the census, and courts of justice. A succeeding volume will discuss the machinery of administration. An interesting feature is the method of citation, quotations being made always in the original Sanskrit text (and alphabet) and not always translated, though occasionally the Sanskrit is transliterated. Readers may however accept the translation as usually literal and exact, despite an occasional freedom implying more than the original, as when the royal seal (on carrier-pigeons) is translated "passport". We know of no other work giving so complete an idea of the original as that of Mr. Law and can recommend it to all students of Oriental history. The text itself has been before the public so short a time that it has hardly been utilized at all except by Mr. Barnett in his recently published *Antiquities of India* and in critical studies by various German scholars in philological journals.

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

Studi Siciliani ed Italioti. Por L. PARETI. Volume I. Contributi alla Scienza dell' Antichità pubblicati da G. De Sanctis e L. Pareti. (Florence: B. Seeber. 1914. Pp. 356.)

THE Turin school of ancient history gave a notable proof of its corporate existence not long since by publishing a collection of studies in memory of Emilio Pozzi, whose career, already rich in achievement but richer still in promise, had been brought to an exceedingly untimely close by a fall in the Roman Forum. Its founder, De Sanctis, and one of its leading members, Pareti of Florence, have now inaugurated with the volume under review a new series of books designed to receive "works in the field of antiquity of a strictly scientific character, which, because of their extent, are ill adapted for insertion among the articles

of periodicals and the memoirs of academies". It is not for an American to gauge the need in Italy of an additional medium for the publication of such things. He may simply note the fact that with the same end in view Beloch has long since been editing his well-known *Studi di Storia Antica*, and that Pais has admitted to his *Studi Storici* articles perilously like those united in the first volume of the new venture. And he may add the comment that the conditions which have dowered us in America with innumerable *Studies in Classical Philology*, etc., are evidently not unknown in Italy, the most obvious, but perhaps merely apparent, divergence being that, whereas with us the university is the organizing agent, in Italy it is the active professor who appears in that rôle.

Academic and professional rivalries do not, however, suffice to account for the present series, nor does it spring solely from the highly commendable energy and resourcefulness of its editors: we have to recognize in it another manifestation of the keen interest which modern Italy is coming to take in the scientific investigation of its national beginnings. In this first volume Pareti deals exclusively with Sicily and Magna Graecia. Of the twelve articles it contains, eight are entirely new. They are now offered, together with the four elsewhere published, as *prolegomena* to a new synthesis which the author leads us to expect he may some day make of the early history of southern Italy.

The first article in the book is a chronological study tending to extend the enterprise of Dorieus in western Sicily over the period from 510 to about 490 B. C., and to make it one of the remote causes of the Carthaginian attack in 479 B. C.; the second makes the tyranny of Gelon begin, not as is commonly believed, at Syracuse, but at Gela, in 485 B. C.; the third holds that it was Anaxilas of Rhegium, whose stock was Messenian, who, on conquering Zankle in 485 B. C., changed its name to Messene; the fourth describes, on the basis of his new chronology, the Sicilian antecedents of the battle of Himera; the fifth sustains the thesis that "the poet Theognis, a native of Megara Hyblaea, was still writing in Sicily during the first two decades of the fifth century—until Gelon in 482 B. C. mastered his home—and later on, in Greece at Megara Nisaea at about 480–479 B.C."; the sixth, which seems to us to be one of the most valuable, dates the campaign of Hamilcar in 479 B. C., traces the rise of the legend which made the battle simultaneous with Salamis or Thermopylae, and treats *à la* Kromayer the strategy, tactics, and *terrain* of the encounter. This last service is done in number eight for the campaign of Himilco and Dionysius around Gela in 405 B. C., and shows that after the destruction of this city by the Mamertini in 282 B. C. the site was never again occupied, but that the Γελῶν continued to exist under their old name in their new city Phintias. The arguments used in the ninth article to prove that the gods of Selinus were derived *via* its metropolis Megara Hyblaea from Megara Nisaea—as is indeed altogether probable—would, we think, prove

equally well that they were derived from Athens, Corinth, or any other normal Greek city. In number ten, which appears also in *Rivista di Filologia*, 1914, pp. 49 ff., Pareti routs Pais, horse, foot, and artillery, in his attempt to derive from Strabo's etymology of the name Rhegium (VI. I, 6, p. 258c) far-reaching conclusions both as to the sources of the geographer and as to the Romanization of Italian cities. Number eleven, on the chronology of the first Greek colonies in Sicily, operates with too many unproven assumptions to yield convincing conclusions.

Of the work as a whole we take pleasure in certifying that it displays abundance of acumen, knowledge, and sound method. If it is marred by anything it is by the Italian love of prolonged ratiocination.

W. S. FERGUSON.

Manuel d'Archéologie Préhistorique Celtique et Gallo-Romaine. Par JOSEPH DÉCHELETTE, Conservateur du Musée de Roanne, Correspondant de l'Institut. Tome II., *Archéologie Celtique ou Protohistorique*. Troisième partie. *Second Âge du Fer ou Époque de la Tène*. (Paris: Auguste Picard. 1914. Pp. viii, 911-1683, plates xiii.)

It is not necessary to repeat here what has been said in review of M. Déchelette's earlier volumes by way of general commendation of his work; nor is there any occasion to qualify the judgments already expressed. The substantial volume now published displays the same thorough and comprehensive scholarship as its predecessor.

It deals with the second Iron Age, or La Tène epoch, which is now generally held to extend from about 500 B. C. to the beginning of the Christian era. This was the period during which the Celtic peoples attained the height of their power and influence in Europe, and on account of the La Tène culture is consequently a description of Celtic civilization in some of its most characteristic phases. Indeed, since Celtic literature is all of much later date, and since the information furnished by classical writers is meagre at best, archaeology is the main resource of the historian in reconstructing the world of the independent Continental Celts.

M. Déchelette finds that the culture of the late iron epoch had its centre in the region about the middle Rhine. From this focal point it was widely disseminated by Celtic emigration and conquests, and was even taken over by Germans and Scandinavians outside the range of Celtic rule. It was developed under Graeco-Roman influence, and in showing the relations of the two civilizations M. Déchelette lays special stress on the influence of industry and commerce. He argues strongly (pp. 914 ff., 1574 ff.), in opposition to what has been a prevalent opinion, that the products of southern arts and crafts found on Celtic soil were brought there largely through peaceful exchange and not as prize of battle. In this volume, as in those which precede it, he gives special

consideration to the question of trade-routes, and concludes that the southern influence, at least in the first part of the La Tène epoch, came rather by way of the Po and the Alps than from Marseilles. The site of La Tène itself, from which the archaeological period derives its name, he holds to have been a "station de péage" and not, as has been commonly supposed, a military stronghold.

It is of course useless to attempt to summarize here the archaeological facts set forth in some seven hundred pages. But a few of the author's opinions or conclusions may be briefly mentioned. Many observations, as might be expected, are made on the subject of Celtic religion. In the discussion of burials considerations of interest are presented concerning the belief in transmigration and some evidence is collected with regard to the practice of human sacrifice. The chapter on amulets and other talismans supplies abundant materials illustrative of the superstitions of the people. In the discussion of trade and commerce (pp. 1529 ff.) a somewhat hazardous theory is proposed which derives from Italy and the south the veneration of the number three, usually regarded hitherto as particularly characteristic of the Celts. Perhaps the most important historical conclusions in the volume relate to the general character of the Celtic civilization and nationality at the time of the rather shadowy "imperium Celticum". Some of M. Déchelette's earliest archaeological studies had to do with the comparison of the *oppidum* of Bibracte in Gaul with that of Stradonitz in Bohemia; and in the second chapter of the present volume he sets forth the results of these and similar investigations, which show a striking unity of culture throughout a wide Celtic area. The evidence of archaeology is confirmed, he argues, by the testimony of place-names and by the statements of the ancient historians; and he suggests that the Celtic domination during the second and third centuries before Christ was an actual forerunner of the "unité romaine" of a later age.

F. N. ROBINSON.

Jewish History and Literature under the Maccabees and Herod. By B. H. ALFORD. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1913. Pp. xvi, 113.)

IN 1910 Mr. Alford published a volume entitled *The Old Testament History and Literature*, discussing the canonical and deuterocanonical books and those parts of Ethiopic Enoch (i.-xxxvi., lxxii.-xc.) that, in his judgment, were written before 135 B. C. The present volume is a continuation dealing with Jewish history and literature during the following 125 years down to the birth of Jesus which is dated in 10 B. C. The author sketches briefly the history of the Hasmonæan dynasty, the Roman rule until the accession of Herod, and the reign of this king. He also gives a summary of the contents of such works as the Book of Jubilees, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Tobit and Judith (only touched

upon in the former volume), Ethiopic Enoch, xci.-cviii. and xxxvii.-lxx., and the Wisdom of Solomon. Two pages at the end refer to the "Magnificat" of Mary, the "Benedictus" of Zacharias, and the "Nunc Dimittis" of Simeon, evidently because they are regarded as coming from the time of Herod, though later than the birth of Jesus. The book is in no sense a fresh contribution to our knowledge of the period. It presents no new facts, no independent treatment of the material already known, no new points of view. Mr. Alford uses the translations and commentaries of a few English scholars, and accepts their opinions without a question. Such a popular account no doubt has its value, as it may help to give a general idea of a deeply interesting period of Jewish history to persons unfamiliar with its leading events and literary productions. There are many such, since the Protestant Bible Societies no longer publish the deuterocanonical books and the Roman Catholic Church has no interest in printing for public use the books it designates as Apocrypha. It is to be feared that the admirable collection edited by Charles under the title *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1913) and the excellent description of this literature by Székely in his *Bibliotheca Apocrypha* (Freiburg, 1913) will be chiefly used by scholars and fail to reach the general public, the former because of its heavy price, the latter because it is written in Latin.

So far as the historic sketches in Mr. Alford's book are concerned they are in the main well drawn. There are some debatable or incorrect statements. Thus there is no evidence that Zerubbabel was sent to Judaea as governor in 537 B. C., that the Hasidaeans became Pharisees, or that "the Jews expected a Messiah from among the Hasmonaeans". The notion of a fixed canon to which books were gradually added dies hard. Mr. Alford thinks that the text of Zechariah vi., may have been changed so as to make "the Branch" apply as a title to the High Priest alone, "when the Book of Zechariah was added to the Canon of Scripture". That Jethro was an example of the union of priestly and royal functions in the same person is an idea that might easily have become popular in the period which found Melchizedek so useful, if only the Pentateuch had anywhere suggested that Jethro was a king. In view of the fact that Palestine was a part of the Ptolemaic kingdom until 200 B. C. it seems extremely improbable that "the earliest approach of Hellenism was from the side of Antioch".

But these matters are of slight importance compared with the questions raised by Mr. Alford's treatment of the literature. A reader of his book gets the impression that it is pretty accurately known when these documents were written and just what parts belonged to them in their original form, while the truth, of course, is that we do not know with certainty the date of a single piece of writing assigned to this period, and there is no real consensus of opinion among scholars even in regard to the most important. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that theories as to composition and date based solely on internal evidence must be

taken with great caution. In a popular work it is necessary to indicate the tentative nature of all such scientific conjectures, though it may be thought needless in a learned treatise, since the specialist generally knows how to discount scholastic assurance and assertion. To take one striking illustration: Following Charles, Mr. Alford places the Parables of Enoch before the Psalms of Solomon in the beginning of the first century B. C. This work exists only in Ethiopic. We do not know whether there ever was a Greek translation of this particular book, and the absence of any quotation from it in patristic literature renders it extremely doubtful. Many peculiarities of language point to an Aramaic original. That it passed through Christian hands is certain. The three terms rendered into English "The Son of Man" correspond to three Aramaic terms, two of which are clearly of Christian origin. It is well-nigh impossible that such expressions as "the kings and the mighty ones in the earth", who "worship the work of their own hands", can refer to Alexander Jannaeus and his Sadducean supporters. All scholars admit that the work has been interpolated by many copyists and some of these seem to have been Christians. There is no binding evidence by which even the original Jewish form of the Parables can be brought back further than to the reign of Caligula. Where so much is in doubt it is extremely unwise to base far-reaching conclusions as to the existence in Jewish thought before the appearance of Christianity of certain ideas expressed in the Ethiopic text of this work. The same criticisms apply to the dating of other literary productions of the period, the tentative character of which should have been indicated. Mr. Alford does not discuss the interesting work published by Schechter in 1910 dealing with the Covenanters of Damascus. Their hope of a Messiah "from Aaron and Israel" deserved to be mentioned.

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT.

Cicero of Arpinum: a Political and Literary Biography, being a Contribution to the History of Ancient Civilization and a Guide to the Study of Cicero's Writings. By E. G. SIHLER, Ph.D., Professor of the Latin Language and Literature, New York University. (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford University Press. 1914. Pp. xi, 487.)

THE manysidedness of Cicero's character and his great versatility make the writing of his life a very difficult matter. His biographer must be qualified to discuss not only his personal qualities, his political career, and his place among the world's orators, but he must also be able to estimate the value of his rhetorical and philosophical treatises and to appreciate his skill as a letter-writer. It is high praise, therefore, to say that Professor Sihler has covered all these subjects, and has covered them well. His book gives us an account of Cicero's life which is unbiassed, comprehensive, and in the main accurate. With his general

estimate of Cicero's character, and of his attitude toward Caesar, Pompey, Crassus, Cato, and Octavius, the reviewer is in hearty accord. He would have to disagree with the author on a few minor points, such as his conception of the judicial reforms of Drusus (p. 15), and his understanding of the military post held by Cicero in 49 B. C. (*cf.* p. 303).

Cicero is kept constantly before our eyes. The book is a life of him, as it should be, not the story of his life and times. This method of treatment, however, makes it impossible to go into a number of puzzling questions which we should like to have more fully discussed. Cases in point are the real purpose of Metellus Nepos (pp. 170 f.), the conspiracy of Vettius (pp. 200 f.), the exact nature of the Clodian legislation against Cicero, which is very inadequately discussed on pages 205-206 (*cf.* pp. 212 and 219), and the wisdom from the military and political points of view of Pompey's evacuation of Italy and of his plan to starve the peninsula into submission. Of the strictly Ciceronian material we should like a fuller account of the anti-Cato episode, of that side of Cicero's character which comes out in his relations with young men, and a discussion of his poetry, which deserves consideration from the standpoint of technique at least.

The form is annalistic, and in the latter part of the book as much of the story as possible is told in extracts translated from Cicero's letters. At certain points the narrative is broken by discursive passages, printed in smaller type, dealing with the sources or giving excellent analyses and estimates of the orations and treatises. The style is very effective. Over the short, vigorous sentences, for instance, in which the Catilinarian story is told there is little danger that the reader's attention will flag, but it is unfortunate that the author's pages have so many blemishes in the way of misprints, and loose and unidiomatic expressions. We have come upon these misprints: "citizen" for citizens (p. 28); "a MSS." (p. 72); "later" for latter (p. 90); "G." for C. (p. 127); "S. C. Ultimatum" (p. 181); "six hundred hence" for six hundred years hence (p. 194), and "fuzzy" for fussy (p. 287). We can give here only a few illustrations of the many unidiomatic or awkward phrases which have fallen under our notice in reading the book: "branch of race" (p. 55); "a programme of action, which while widely apart" (p. 156); "independent from Livy" (p. 202); "one could insinuate one's self to Cicero" (p. 195); "stung with the point of a sharp instrument" (pp. 196-197); "these news" (p. 212); "it" and "herself" of the same subject (pp. 57-58); "here probably . . . there was at first perhaps" (p. 128); "Atticus had talked with Balbus at Rome, whether there was" etc. (p. 319). Many of the translations should also be recast, *cf.*, *e.g.*, page 174. When these defects are removed, the book will be not only one of the most trustworthy and comprehensive biographies of Cicero which we have, but one of the most readable.

FRANK FROST ABBOTT.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Studies in Taxation under John and Henry III. By SYDNEY KNOX MITCHELL, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History, Yale College. [Yale Historical Publications, Studies, II.] (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford University Press. 1914. Pp. xiii, 407.)

THIS work contains the first detailed account of those taxes of the thirteenth century, the receipts from which made up the king's extraordinary revenue. None of the previous writers on medieval taxation having attempted such a description as Dr. Mitchell has given us, his work marks a long step in advance towards adequate knowledge of the field he has covered.

The method of treatment in the first nine chapters, three-fourths of the work, is rigidly chronological. Under the dates of their grant or imposition is given a full account of "the dona on religious houses, the tallage, the scutage levied in connection with campaigns, and the aids, under which term are grouped three levies: the aid on knights' fees, called also scutage, the carucage, and the tax on personal property" (p. 9). In each case the history of the tax is traced from its grant until it reached the central government. The final chapter contains the author's conclusions, and a study of the effect of taxation upon the development of corporate unity among the baronage.

The scutage receives a full and satisfactory treatment. The accounts of the separate levies are based upon a wide reading of the printed sources and of the manuscript records in the Public Record Office. It seems to be proved that the scutage retained its character as a composition for service, though it was not the only composition, throughout the period of this study. The establishment of this fact is a distinct contribution to our knowledge. The few instances of its use as a general tax are carefully differentiated from the normal levy. The accounts of the levies of the carucage and tallage are less detailed. The generally received opinion that the carucage was levied upon the land and not upon the plough receives added confirmation. The treatment of the tallage is rather meagre at times (pp. 220, 249-250, 256) when its importance as a source of revenue is considered. It would seem that it might have been possible to have given some details concerning the amounts paid by the towns, in order that an idea of the development of the tax might be gained.

Though the descriptions of the taxes upon movables are by far the best that have been published, they suffer from the lack of a thorough examination of the manuscript records. The results of such an examination would have materially changed but a few of the author's statements, yet they would have thrown much light upon the formal precepts issued by the government. The writs issued to the justices in charge of the assessment of the subsidy of 1225 describe only the property which was

to be exempted from taxation (p. 164). There are, however, two local assessment rolls preserved (Exchequer Lay Subsidies 242/47, 242/127) which contain accurate information concerning the movables that were taxed. The summary of the accounts rendered by the collectors of the subsidy of 1232 (L. T. R. Foreign Accounts, Roll 1, m. 6) throws a flood of light upon the system of exemption and separate payment. For neither of the subsidies have these records been utilized and there are similar omissions elsewhere.

There are many repetitions in the first part of the work, due to the method of treatment and, therefore, to be pardoned. The style is rather dry. On every page, however, there is evidence of a mastery of most of the pertinent original material. Though neither in purpose nor in result a book for the general reader, it is a very valuable guide to the taxes of the thirteenth century.

JAMES F. WILLARD.

Roger Bacon Essays. Contributed by various Writers on the Occasion of the Commemoration of the Seventh Centenary of his Birth. Collected and edited by A. G. LITTLE. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1914. Pp. 425.)

FOURTEEN essays are contributed by as many scholars from various fields of natural science, mathematics, medicine, literature, linguistics, philosophy, palaeography, and artillery. An appendix of fifty pages gives in revised form the bibliography of Bacon's writings published by Mr. Little in 1911. There is no index. Of the essays, four are written in German; two in French; one, by an American, Professor David Eugene Smith. Of the contributors five have been or are engaged in editing Bacon's writings; others have previously published books or articles concerning him; others are authors of general histories of the departments of learning to which they now estimate Bacon's contributions or relations.

"One is liable", writes Professor Smith, "to be led away by enthusiasm when writing upon the occasion of the seven hundredth anniversary of any great leader, to read into his works what is not there, and to ascribe to him abilities which he never possessed" (p. 182). This tendency, however, most of the essayists have successfully resisted; and, while there is a certain amount of the eulogy inevitable upon such an occasion, one lays down the volume convinced that its authors have damned Roger Bacon with faint praise, and that his reputation, like Pyrrhus's army, will hardly stand another such anniversary. Their careful examination of writings by Bacon, which have recently been brought to light in manuscript form or are difficult of access in rare old editions, has failed to add much to his stock of ideas found in the now familiar *Opus Maius* and *Opus Tertium*, and cannot be very encouraging to those trying to raise a fund for the publication of all his works. His

indebtedness to others for many of the ideas on which his fame has rested is indicated, not only by the reaffirmation by the German writers on his Optic of its derivation from the Arab Alhazen (Ibn al Haitam), but by the essay of Professor Baur, who has recently edited the philosophical writings of Robert Grosseteste, upon the latter's influence on Bacon. He asserts that "many laurels" from Roger's "wreath of fame" really belong to Robert, with whose writings Bacon's sometimes coincide verbally. Throughout the volume Bacon's mistakes and superstitions are noted, and, while some writers still regard his trust in experience as marvellous for his times, others make strictures upon his "experimental science". Mr. Pattison Muir admits that Bacon "was not altogether happy in his treatment of what we now call chemical changes. He does not appear to have studied these events much at first-hand. He followed the footsteps of others" (p. 318). Duhem, treating of Bacon's physics, says, "On aime à faire de Roger Bacon un adepte précoce de la méthode expérimentale; des pages comme celles-ci nous montrent assez qu'il expérimentait seulement en imagination." Duhem also illustrates the inane scholastic meanderings in which Bacon's physics could indulge. Dr. Withington gets little of value out of Bacon's medical treatises. Professor Smith, after a survey of "the mathematics of Bacon's time", concludes that he was not justified "in assuming the attitude of superiority which he showed towards most of his contemporaries" (p. 182), that "he contributed nothing to the pure science" (p. 171), and that "mathematics meant to him little more than astronomy" (p. 173). Smith should say "astrology".

Two essays should be mentioned as of different scope from the others. Sir John Edwin Sandys writes on "Roger Bacon in English Literature". Mr. A. G. Little's Introduction gives an excellent moderate statement of the facts of Bacon's life. The only instances where he seems to err are in following the authority of Father Mandonnet at pages 8-9 and 25. Another valuable feature, which his essay shares with several others, is the demonstration that Bacon's writings were not almost forgotten for centuries but exerted a continuous influence.

The chief criticism which may be made of this book is that several essays, unlike those of Baur and Smith, are mere presentations of Bacon's views without sufficient evidence to enable us to estimate his comparative importance. Thus, Dr. Hirsch, while granting that Bacon was no modern comparative philologist, asserts that he was distinctly superior to his contemporaries, but gives us no references to them. Of three German physicists who contribute papers, Dr. Würschmidt merely describes the treatise *De Speculis*; Dr. Vogl's references are exclusively to Brewer's and Bridges's familiar editions of Bacon's works; and Professor Wiedemann's sole note is to Würschmidt's paper. Vogl even appears to have embodied several of Bridges's notes in his paper: compare Vogl, page 214, line 33, with Bridges, II. 428, note 1; Vogl, page 216, lines 22-27, with Bridges, II. 431, note 1; Vogl, page 220, line 25, with Bridges,

II. 46, note; Vogl, page 221, lines 17-25, with Bridges, II. 67, marginal topic, and II. 68, note 1.

I cannot accept the main theses of two essays, namely, Professor Duhem's "Roger Bacon et l'Horreur du Vide", and Colonel Hime's "Roger Bacon and Gunpowder". The physical theory which Duhem credits Bacon with inventing is set forth in chapter LVIII. of the *Quaestiones Naturales* of Adelard of Bath, written over a hundred years before Bacon's treatises. Colonel Hime tries to prove Roger Bacon the inventor of gunpowder by the method which has been employed to prove Francis Bacon the author of Shakespeare's plays—a cipher; but other considerations than the cipher itself invalidate his conclusions. I hope to deal with these two methods elsewhere more fully than present space permits.

A few errors of detail should be noted. In note 1 on page 71 the reference should be to *Moyen Âge*, November, 1894, instead of 1891. One finds the spelling "Pecham" on pages 24, 28, and 235; "Peckham" on 152 and 159. I cannot find the phrase "*homo sapientissimus*" in the passage cited by Hirsch (p. 139); and Hirsch's logic in the two following pages would excite the derision of Bacon's "scholastic contemporaries". Smith (p. 157) incorrectly dates Adelard of Bath about 1180—perhaps a slip for 1130. At pages 262 and 263 we find described two different "troisième expériences"; one of them should be changed to "second" or "fourth". Breaks in quotations are not always indicated by dots (*e. g.*, page 165, line 3, after "attained"); and one is never sure whether the passages set up in close type are true quotations or not. Vogl seems the chief offender in this respect. He runs together passages from 40 to 400 pages apart in Bridges's text and indiscriminately juxtaposes exact translation and loose paraphrase and condensation of Bacon's wording. Moreover, the passage on pages 225-226 for which the foot-note cites Bridges, II. 78, 92, is mainly from Bridges, II. 52-53. Dr. Withington's digression into the history of astrology (pp. 343-345) contains two or three misleading statements.

LYNN THORNDIKE.

The Place of the Reign of Edward II. in English History. Based upon the Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford in 1913, by T. F. Tout, M.A., F.B.A., Bishop Fraser Professor of Medieval and Ecclesiastical History. [Publications of the University of Manchester, Historical Series, no. XXI.] (Manchester: The University Press. 1914. Pp. xvi, 421.)

ONE of the greatest needs in English history is a careful study of the administrative system in the later Middle Ages. Anyone who has investigated this period, though never so slightly, is aware of the many unsolved problems which now stand in the way of a thorough understanding of the constitutional development. There is no field in which

more important work waits to be done. Fortunately the publication in recent years of the various calendars of official documents has cleared a part of the way at last for the supplying of this want, and the appearance of such books as Professor Baldwin's *King's Council* and this volume of Professor Tout's are an earnest of what we may expect in future.

Probably the most significant contribution of Professor Tout's book is his study of the organization and functions particularly of the Chamber and the Wardrobe as offices of administration in the reign of Edward II., a period which the author truly says must be considered a turning point in English administrative history. For the twenty years of this reign, more, possibly, than any other period of equal length, mark the advance away from the old system of undifferentiated administration under which the great officials performed all sorts of functions in turn, toward a division of labor and the growth of separate bureaus of administration, each with its staff of trained administrators.

The administrative history of the reign is largely a record of the routine work of a considerable number of minor officials; and the value of this investigation lies in the fact that this routine work is here studied from the unprinted Wardrobe Accounts, and in the further fact that at the outset of the reign the Wardrobe was as much a department of the national administration as the Exchequer and the Chancery themselves. It is in this period that we may perceive the beginnings, in the field of the royal revenue, of the later fundamental distinction between the king and the crown.

The author, however, does not restrict himself to the Wardrobe and the Chamber, but has added valuable chapters on the Exchequer and the Chancery, which are less important only because they are briefer and because they deal with subjects better known. His account of the great constitutional struggle between the Ordainers and the King's Favorites which produced the famous ordinances of 1311, while naturally not bringing out many new facts, is full of original suggestions and new points of view which cannot lightly be rejected. This is particularly true of his estimate of the constructive work of the Despencers in administration and of the financial difficulties inherited by Edward II. from his father.

While the main theme of the book is the history of administration and of the constitutional struggle, the author has added a few sections on the history of the Staple, the art of war, the relations of Church and State, and the foreign and imperial policy of the reign. These sections, he explains, are to be regarded merely as "supplementary to the story of political and administrative reform already told", inserted "rather to indicate new points of view than to emphasize once more a well-recognized standpoint".

Not the least valuable feature of the volume is the careful list of administrative officers of the reign given in appendix II. For judicial officers we have the old lists given by Dugdale in the *Chronica* series ap-

pended to his *Origines Juridiciales*, and the later work of Foss in his *Tabulae Curiales*. But these were in great need of revision and they include only the greater judicial officers, while Professor Tout has added also many other officers of administration. Appendix I. consists of the important Household Ordinance of 1318.

Space will not permit a detailed examination of the many interesting suggestions of the book. It is a valuable one; and the author's promised volume on the history of the Wardrobe, the Chamber, and the Small Seals, will be awaited with interest by all students of English constitutional history.

C. H. McILWAIN.

The Reformation in Germany. By HENRY C. VEDDER, Professor of Church History, Crozer Theological Seminary. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. xlix, 466.)

"THIS is the first attempt, in the English language, at least, to interpret the religious struggle of the sixteenth century in terms of economics." It is the publisher's wrapper that thus challenges our interest. In his Foreword the author himself states that he has spent many years of study on the enormous mass of material now accessible, and that "he has neglected nothing in the more recent literature that promised the least assistance toward a better understanding of the facts or their more accurate determination"; therefore he feels "reasonably confident that he has missed little of substantial value". Important points he buttresses with citations of the contemporary sources, now and then giving extracts in foot-notes. In the appendixes he presents fifty-one pages of documents in translation, thus republishing material previously issued separately under the title of *Historical Leaflets*, including Tetzels Theses, the Edict of Worms, the Protest at Speyer, the Religious Peace of Augsburg, and "Against the Murdering and Robbing Bands of the Peasants". To guide the reader through the labyrinth of facts he offers a logical clue; and endeavors to create "a readable narrative, worth while for its own sake".

Readable the book undeniably is, in spite of the large page dancing with small type. But for occasional reproductions of tedious theological debates, such as the fifteen pages on the Leipzig Disputation of 1519, and the disquisition on the development of indulgences, the style is fairly vigorous, as might be expected from one who in earlier years was a journalist. He does not drag in the dramatic; he merely glows with a social gospel. Feeling occasionally flashes up into generalization; light is sometimes accompanied by heat. Emphasizing the economic interpretation of history, he dares not focus his enthusiasm on any personality; Luther, who "bestrode Europe like a colossus, dwarfing all men of his time, because of what he was", was "in reality but a chip upon the current of events" (p. 367). Dr. Vedder's real heroes scarcely cross the

stage, though their pathetic shadows flit behind the scenes; they are the Anabaptists, who "sought a true democracy, through a revival of the social gospel proclaimed by Jesus and realized for a time in the primitive church" (p. 293); they "alone had penetrated beneath the surface of traditional Christianity and comprehended the real Gospel of Jesus"; they perceived that "the acceptance of it implied and necessitated a reconstruction of society until all institutions could endure the measurement of the Golden Rule" (p. 345); and when they "were silenced, trampled into the mud, destroyed . . . the clock of civilization was set back three hundred years" (p. 386). Luther, in spite of all his initial inevitableness as the spokesman of the popular demand for reform, became an unreasoning conservative and persecutor, marked now and then by "insane bigotry" and "pig-headed obstinacy" (p. 313); "indeed, if one may trust the evidence of his polemic writings, Luther knew a good deal more about the devil than he did about God; and he certainly manifests more of a Satanic than of a Christian spirit" (p. 309). The reactionary rebel of Wittenberg, who thwarted the almost uniformly hostile bishops by inducing the princes to assume the episcopal power, was acting according to the dictates of class consciousness; "ingrained deference to rank" he elevated to the plane of religious duty, so that "the institutional forms of Lutheranism . . . should be viewed as the inevitable consequence of Luther's peasant birth and breeding" (p. 267). The economic factor was most prominent in the ultimate triumph of the Lutheran movement in large regions of Germany, for it "really owed its success far less to religious fervor than to social ferment and political selfishness" (p. 384); "evidences of greed and ambition fairly shout themselves at the student of all contemporary documents" (p. 387). Yet Professor Vedder does not maintain that the economic interpretation is the key that unbars all the locks. Even to him "the Reformation was a complex movement, inspired by a variety of ideas and aims, social, political and religious" (p. 384).

Such is the construction placed upon the course of German history during the first half of the sixteenth century; upon what is it based? The foundations are usually able to bear the weight placed upon them, but not all the bricks are sound. Is it always safe to quote Luther on the basis of the St. Louis edition, which is an enlarged reprint of the convenient but faulty edition published at Halle by Walch early in the reign of Frederick the Great? In spite of the fidelity of the American editor, one must often look elsewhere for the best texts. Is it safe to neglect official documents like the *Reichstagsakten* and the *Nuntiaturberichte*? In view of the plethora of material noted in the latest edition of the *Quellenkunde* of Dahmann-Waitz (1912) one cannot censure all omissions, but one often scans the foot-notes with unsatisfied longing. As regards secondary literature, apart from Janssen, whose influence is unmistakable, the Roman Catholic writers on the period have been but little used, Pastor and Grisar apparently not at all. On such omissions

the bibliographies of the *Catholic Encyclopedia* shed much illumination. It is to be assumed that the recent German church histories covering the period have been consulted; but Karl Müller, Möller-Kawerau, and Hermelink have left no direct traces, whereas the exuberant foot-notes of Gieseler, who died sixty years ago, still color certain portions of the narrative. More serious is the small use made of works on economic history, as noted for instance in the second edition of R. Kötzschke's *Deutsche Wirtschaftsgeschichte bis zum Siebzehnten Jahrhundert*. In spite of the author's frequent citation of German monographs of the last fifteen years one feels not quite satisfied; and in certain selected portions of the work this impression is deepened by the cumulative effect of minor inaccuracies. Thus within ten pages there occur the following slips: Luther's tract of 1523 is called *Formula missae et commissionis*, instead of *communio* (p. 268, note 1); the portion of the Augsburg Confession alluded to on page 274, note 1, is article XXVIII., not "XXVII."; the name "John a Plainitz" (p. 277, note 2) should be Hans von der Planitz. Certain statements also provoke dissent. Did not the mad Jan of Leyden, Anabaptist king of Münster, expire under the torture, so that he did not "die of exposure and starvation" in the iron cage that is still on the church tower (p. 348)? Such at least is the testimony of the contemporary Henricus Dorpius: "man . . . bindt sie an drey seulen, und reist sie mit glüenden zangen zu tod, und hing sie darnach jnn dreien eisern körben an S. Lamberts kirchthurm zu einem ewigen gedechtnis" (*Warhafftige Historie*, 1536, fol. [G iii]). As for the mummied hand shown in the town hall at Münster (p. 349), its female custodian told the present writer a little over a year ago that it had belonged not to Jan of Leyden but to a secretary who had betrayed some secrets regarding the peace of Westphalia, negotiated in part in that very room. It is likewise incorrect to say (p. 310) that the castle at Marburg is "still occasionally the residence of the German Emperors"; the Prussians found it a prison and converted it into archives, which have no state apartments whatever. That Philip of Hesse had a "public repetition" of his bigamous marriage (p. 353) is quite untrue; the ceremony was neither public nor a repetition. These errors are all in minor matters, and do not vitiate the main contentions of the work, whose thesis is stated in the long and excellent introduction; but as most of these points are generally admitted, for instance by T. M. Lindsay in his *History of the Reformation*, the ultimate question is, Has Professor Vedder overstressed the economic factors in the development of the Lutheran movement? The answer must inevitably be that while he has been very fair in the allotment of space, his emphasis has often been one-sided and sometimes polemical. Is this justifiable even from the pedagogical point of view?

WILLIAM WALKER ROCKWELL.

The Renaissance, the Protestant Revolution, and the Catholic Reformation in Continental Europe. By EDWARD MASLIN HULME, Professor of History, University of Idaho. (New York: The Century Company. 1914. Pp. 589.)

"To George Lincoln Burr, best of teachers and best of friends, this book, so deeply indebted to him, is dedicated." This graceful acknowledgment of obligation stands at the threshold of the work under review. Students who read the book and are happily familiar with Professor Burr's *Outlines of Studies in the History of the Renaissance and the Reformation, with suggestions as to the sources of knowledge*, "printed, not published" by the learned author, will not be entirely in doubt as to the extent of the debt. Others are entitled to know that the book is a "writing-up" of the *Outlines*. It has the chronological limits (1300-1600) of the *Outlines*; its three parts are the same; the chapter titles are substantially and usually identically those of the *Outlines*; the larger divisions of the separate chapters, the marginal rubrics, and the topics treated within the paragraphs of the chapters, with rare exceptions, follow, in order, the analysis of the *Outlines*. How much farther the debt extends, in what degree the treatment of the topics and the interpretation of the larger movements rest upon the ripe instruction of the Cornell master, the reviewer has no means of determining; but a careful reading of the book leads him to the opinion that Mr. Hulme has worked over the entire field for himself and has made it in large measure his own.

It may be affirmed as certain that Professor Burr, generous and modest scholar that he is, interprets the dedication as an adequate acknowledgment of the extraordinary obligations of his former student. On the other hand, the unusual character of the debt imperatively demanded, in the judgment of the reviewer, that the reader of the new book should be given an unusually explicit explanation of its character, and the absence of this explanation must be held to be a regrettable error of judgment on the part of the gentleman whose name appears on the title-page.

The book is presumably designed for advanced college classes, and the absence of bibliographical data may be explained and excused by their abundant presence in Burr's *Outlines*. Its erudition is marked; it is a thesaurus of lore on the leading, minor, and curious personalities in the intellectual, scientific, artistic, literary, and religious life of the period. The style is dignified and felicitous, although at times not untouched with preciosity. It differentiates itself from comparable works in English by its broader conception of the Middle Ages, by its more critical attitude toward Luther and Calvin, and by its more liberal treatment of Roman Catholicism. In a word, its merits are numerous and weighty. It remains for the reviewer merely to indicate some of the respects in which it is defective.

The chapters dealing with political history are largely unilluminated or unilluminating detail, and the same is true of the chapters on the Revolt of the Netherlands and the Religious Wars in France. In view of the larger questions with which the book is primarily concerned, "politics and wars" should "have been relegated to the background" (p. 49) much more completely.

The treatment of the "Renaissance" suggests that Mr. Hulme has not yet thought the matter through. If the "deep, underlying cause of the Renaissance was the revival of the individual" (p. 61), if the "medieval and humanistic ideals are irreconcilable and mutually exclusive" (p. 88), what shall be made of this: "The essential characteristic of the Spanish genius seems to be its extreme individualism. Spain, as a whole, then, was little affected by humanism" (p. 107). Vital and essentially medieval individualism did exist. (Cf. D. Schäfer's summary, *Neuzeit*, 1907, I. 13 ff.)

The fundamental flaw in the treatment of the Reformation is the failure to recognize that both the Protestant and the Catholic Reformations were rooted in religious fervor. To say that the "deepest significance of the [Protestant] Revolution lies . . . in the profound awakening of the religious sentiment that it produced" (p. 370), is to treat cause as effect. Luther and Calvin come off rather too badly in comparison with Zwingli. The omission of a chapter on the English Revolt from Rome, which is sketched in Burr's *Outlines*, is inexcusable. The short paragraph devoted to this topic (p. 345) contains a number of extraordinary statements. The chapter on "The Pope, the Comet, and the Devil" is whimsical.

The proof-reading is not well done. "Phillippe" (p. 536), "Gerusalemene" (p. 542), "Vergillian" (p. 543), "checquered" (p. 544), "Alfarach" (p. 547), "Giovanni de Bologna" (p. 551), illustrate this criticism. Siena has dropped out of the index with odd results. The format of the book is very creditable to the publishers.

GEORGE C. SELLERY.

The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795. By PETER GUILDAY, Docteur ès Sciences Morales et Historiques (Louvain), Instructor in Church History, Catholic University of America. Volume I. *The English Colleges and Convents in the Catholic Low Countries, 1558-1795.* (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1914. Pp. liv, 480.)

FROM the accession of Queen Elizabeth down to the French Revolution, numbers of Roman Catholic Englishmen lived as exiles in what were originally the Spanish Netherlands. Here they found safety from persecution; here they composed elaborate apologies of the ancient faith; here they organized many a cloister and college, and here some of the more restless spirits plotted in favor of Mary, Queen of Scots, or of this

or that Pretender. Though "the number of English exiles on the Continent never exceeded at any given time the round figure of three thousand" (p. xx), there were among the little groups into which they were divided representatives of some of the oldest families in England, including some men of light and leading, as may be seen from the statistical reports of the English spies.

In Dr. Guilday's chosen field, the history of these colleges and convents, no comprehensive work has been attempted since 1849, though there have been many detailed investigations of special points: the existing printed material which he has listed fills twenty pages. In addition, he has searched for unprinted matter in archives and libraries of England, Spain, and Rome, with good results; from Rome alone he prints twenty-two pages of new documents. In Belgium itself, and in France, however, he discovered disappointingly little, for which he blames the French Revolution (p. viii); yet he did not himself use the Belgian diocesan archives, because their contents are not yet completely classified and catalogued.

In this first volume Dr. Guilday has attempted "a general description of the religious and educational activity of the English Catholic Exiles in the Low Countries" (p. 421). He has been obliged to postpone to a second volume those aspects of his subject which are most interesting to the historian of education and to the student of intellectual development; thus he has not as yet discussed the organization and curricula of the seminaries, and the literary activity of the exiles.

After a preliminary chapter on the English foundation movement in general, the author treats the orders like the Benedictines, the Carthusians, and the Jesuits; he also deals at length with the English College at Douay. Then he considers the various orders for women, and brings to light new evidence in favor of Mary Ward, often spoken of as the founder of the "Jesuitesses", who by a Roman decision of 1909 is entitled to be called the sole and legitimate foundress of the flourishing Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary. To the animosity felt by the English secular clergy for the Society of Jesus, Dr. Guilday attributes the suppression of her work, the confiscation of her property, and her incarceration in the prisons of the Inquisition (p. 176 f.). This is however an exception to the author's rule not to discuss at any length the bitter quarrels by which the exiled groups were often torn. As the documents which describe these feuds from the standpoint of the Seculars or of the English Benedictines are far more plentiful than those which give the Jesuit side, he declines to pronounce judgment, and awaits the publication of the official history of the Jesuits in England, promised in the series which includes the well-known works of Duhr and of Fouqueray. If his attitude toward quarrels among the Catholics is most circumspect, he does not hide his opinion of the Virgin Queen. "Elizabeth was not an ordinary usurper. She was a tyrant of the worst type, without pity, the willing tool of those that hated the Church for gain's sake, and she

was not accorded the same patient courtesy the Christian world meted out to a legitimate occupant of a throne" (p. xxii).

Cardinal Gasquet has carried the story of the English monasteries down to the Dissolution in the time of Henry VIII.; Dr. Guilday has now brought the narrative to the year 1795. It remains for some future historian to continue the investigation down to the present, when so many of the old Netherlandish foundations have moved across the Channel (see the tabular view, p. 40).

The researches have been made with great care and diligence, and they open up many paths for future investigators. Though not meant for the popular reader, the present work is timely: it describes the life of English exiles in Belgium, and appears when England is harboring thousands of Belgian refugees. It is also welcome as an admirable example of a thesis for the doctorate prepared at the now desolated University of Louvain, long recognized as perhaps the foremost Roman Catholic centre in Northern Europe for the study of ecclesiastical history. There are but few other teachers of church history in the United States who are at all acquainted with European archives. Through the impulse given by recent graduates like Dr. Guilday, Louvain may help to raise professional standards in America.

WILLIAM WALKER ROCKWELL.

The Seymour Family. By A. AUDREY LOCKE. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914. Pp. viii, 386.)

The Cavendish Family. By FRANCIS BICKLEY. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1914. Pp. vii, 326.)

The Cecil Family. By G. RAVENSCROFT DENNIS. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1914. Pp. vi, 327.)

The La Tremoille Family. By WINIFRED STEPHENS. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1914. Pp. xvi, 341.)

THESE four volumes form a part of a *Great Families* series aiming to relate the origin and achievements of leading English and Continental families. Certain common characteristics mark those which have thus far appeared. They are not mere pieces of book-making designed to lure the reader who feeds on inconsequential and scandalous gossip, but sober, painstaking narratives based on the sources as well as the secondary literature, general and special. Each, in varying degrees, contains arid stretches, pages of familiar history, military and political, in which the more prominent members of the respective families were involved, plus some inevitable small beer in the case of a few whom nothing but an hereditary name would drag from oblivion. On the other hand, not a little new matter that is vivid and significant finds a place, and the lesser folk are, as a rule, courageously dismissed with scant mention. All four authors are admirably impartial: they "nothing extenuate, nor set down aught in malice".

Miss Locke gives us a picture of Henry VIII's third consort, Jane Seymour, which will be novel to most from its unflattering lights. Strikingly interesting is the story of the "Proud Duke" whose fame rests chiefly on his share in securing the Hanoverian succession, and who, with all his pride, was not above slinking in Harley's back door on occasion. That unsavory person the third Marquess of Hertford, whom Thackeray "damned to everlasting fame" in *Vanity Fair*, and whose last days are described so scathingly by Greville is shown to have been not without his good points, while his "wasted, misguided life", is partly explained by the fact that his declining years were "overshadowed by madness". The long drawn out account of the Lord Protector and his brother the Lord Admiral might have been compressed to advantage, and the rather confusing relations between the two branches of the house of Seymour would have been vastly clarified by a genealogical table. Indeed, all the volumes suffer from this lack, except for brief tables devoted to special branches of the Cecils and La Tremoilles. Walpole's witticism (quoted p. 274) is one of his best. A few slips might be noted. The account of the famous Floyd's case (p. 132) is so condensed as to be misleading. The name of the famous general, Lord Ligonier, is misspelled "Legonier" (p. 244). It is extremely doubtful whether Bute retained his secret influence so late as the advent of the Rockingham ministry (p. 252). Wilkes returned to England in 1768 not 1769 (p. 257). "Ferdinand, king of Prussia", must surely be wrong (p. 261) and Marck, duke of Albemarle, is an obvious misprint for Monck. No mention is made of the alleged marriage of George V. with the daughter of Admiral Seymour.

Mr. Bickley shows a scholarly caution in discussing the origin of the Cavendishes. What he has told about such picturesque figures as the formidable Bess of Hardwick, the learned Margaret, duchess of Newcastle, the captivating Georgiana, duchess of Devonshire, and that strange recluse and scientific genius Henry Cavendish, makes us wish that he had proportioned his work so as to set forth more such intimate details. However, he has contributed various findings that are welcome: for example, his ample account of the causes for the first Duke of Devonshire's imprisonment on the eve of the Revolution of 1688. Many pungent phrases of the author's and numerous felicitous quotations from contemporary sources might be quoted if space permitted. Duchess Margaret's defense of her literary activities contains observations worth pondering on in any age. The "hereditary probity" of the Cavendishes and their preference for retirement are well brought out, though, apparently, Mr. Bickley has not seen Holland's recent biography of the late Duke of Devonshire, else he would have inserted the duke's admirable story anent the proudest moment of his life. It is no longer believed that "the wars of the Roses made a holocaust of the old families". In view of what is known of the value of money in the sixteenth century one is inclined to doubt that £80,000 was spent on Chatsworth. It is

hardly correct to designate the elder Pitt as "the most capable politician of the day" (p. 217) and certainly misleading to say that tea was shipped to Boston free of duty (p. 227).

In many respects, especially from the standpoint of the historical scholar, G. Ravenscroft Dennis's *House of Cecil* is the most significant volume of the four. The author devotes chief attention to Lord Burghley, to the first Earl, and the third Marquess of Salisbury. While pretending to no originality in the case of Burghley and the late marquess she makes a real contribution in her account of the famous minister of James I., using the Hatfield manuscripts to good purpose. Throughout the book she very properly devotes her chief attention to personal rather than public questions. We are brought very close to the Earl of Salisbury, largely by means of contemporary estimates and letters, and while no attempt is made to conceal his faults we are left with the impression of having been in the presence of a really great man. His effusive letter to Elizabeth (pp. 152-153) is counterbalanced by one that is truly magnificent (pp. 197-198) and Raleigh's to him on the death of the earl's wife is unique in its loftiness of feeling (pp. 166-167). There are two delicious stories concerning "Old Sarum", the wife of the first Marquess of Salisbury (pp. 239-240). The account of the late prime minister is marked by strong conservative sympathies and by a decided animus against Gladstone, but Miss Dennis's final estimate of her hero is just and discriminating. The following are minor points which may be questioned. The use of Roman numerals in accounts was not exceptional up to the last century (p. 27). Antiquated notions as to the value of balance of trade are expressed (p. 61). It is not surprising that the earl's lack of external graces did not stand in his way in securing employment under Elizabeth.

Miss Winifred Stephens takes us across the channel and traces the history of the La Tremoille family from the Middle Ages to the French Revolution. While she has read widely in addition, she has made chief use of the family archives published by Duke Charles Louis in the last century. Brutality, greed, and sensuality as well as heroism and loyalty have been characteristic of the various members of the house and all is chronicled with equal frankness. The annals of the fourteenth century are enlivened by extracts from Froissart, and while there is rather too much on the wars of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, this is offset by much that is graphic: the romance of Condé, the stirring story of the Lady of Lathom who figures so largely in *Peveril of the Peak*, the amazing career of the Princess des Ursins, and the thrilling adventures of the leaders of the family during the French Revolution; indeed, the treatment of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries abounds in interest. While Miss Stephens has an eye for the picturesque and writes at times with dramatic power her style here and there is marred by colloquialisms and threadbare conventional expressions. Moreover, she is inclined to be rather uncritical in the use of the early chroniclers. One

questions, for example, whether Louis, the second count, became so absorbed in hunting that he would pass whole days without food or drink (p. 53). To speak of a *condottierri* (p. 74) is a distressing blunder, and obviously 1559, the date given for the birth of the Lady of Lathom, is a misprint for 1599 (p. 122). It is usually supposed that the Spanish ambassador at Paris and not Louis XIV. made the famous statement, "il n'y a plus de Pyrénées" (p. 231), and it is hardly fair to say that the Archduke Charles of Austria "called himself Charles III." of Spain, since he was proclaimed such by the allies (p. 244).

Externally these volumes are all that could be desired. The coats of arms of the respective families are stamped on the outside covers and each volume is illustrated, the pictures relating to the La Tremoilles being particularly fine. Altogether, the series promises to be of interest for the general reader and useful, in some degree, to the historian.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

Harrington and his Oceana: a Study of a Seventeenth-Century Utopia and its Influence in America. By H. F. RUSSELL SMITH, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer in History at St. John's College, Cambridge. (Cambridge: The University Press. 1914. Pp. ix, 223.)

IN this work we have a well-proportioned study of James Harrington's political ideas—their source, setting, and influence. The portions of the book treating of the life of Harrington, his style of argument, the significance of his theories, and the efforts made by himself and his friends to secure the adoption of his proposals by the English government, present nothing substantially beyond what has been contributed by Masson, Toland, Dwight, and others. The value of the work as a new estimation of Harrington's ideas lies in the parts which deal with the contemporary sources of Harrington's views, the contemporary criticism and defense of his proposals, and the subsequent influence of his ideas upon writers and statesmen in England, America, and France.

The main propositions of the *Oceana* are that political supremacy in any community must follow superiority in the ownership of landed property, and that for stability and soundness in government four devices are necessary—namely, the secret ballot, indirect election, rotation in office, and a bicameral legislature wherein the functions of debating and voting are kept separate. The author makes it clear that Harrington could draw these proposals, as well as the other essential features of his Utopia, not only from Roman historians and Greek philosophers, but also from events of his time, from suggestions put forth by men active in the constitutional reconstructions of his day, and from practices in city governments in Italy, the Netherlands, and France, in ecclesiastical and academic elections, and in the administration of merchant guilds. Har-

rington's originality consisted in the co-ordination and adaptation of these ideas into a national system.

In following the notions of Harrington through subsequent writings in England the author seeks first to assign to Harrington primary influence for ideas on the political balance of property, set forth by various writers of the Restoration period. But no definite or close connection is successfully established here, save in the case of Harrington's friend Neville, in whose *Plato Redivivus* Harrington's influence is clear, but also familiar. In the eighteenth century he cites the well-known influence of Harrington's proposals upon the ideas of David Hume, who acknowledged the influence. For the nineteenth century, he shows that George Grote, in his persistent agitation for the adoption of the ballot in parliamentary elections, drew freely from Harrington's writings; and an unpublished essay (in the British Museum) by Grote, on *Oceana*, is described.

For Harrington's influence in America, the author centres his attention, first, upon the seventeenth-century colonial "constitutions" framed for the Carolinas, the New Jerseys, and Pennsylvania; and, secondly, upon the first state constitutions. Though for the former comparisons his examination is specific, in no instance does he make a strong case for any independent influence from Harrington. For the early state constitutions, the net results of his argument leave us only with the fact of John Adams's advocacy, in his recommendations to constitution-makers in several states, of such devices as indirect election, rotation in office, the separation of powers, and with Adams's well-known admiration for Harrington's discussion of these matters.

For France the author draws interesting parallels between the government of "Oceana" and the plan of government prepared by the Abbé Sieyès as a basis for the Constitution of the Year 1800. He also cites contemporary references to show that Harrington was read in France at the time and that Sieyès was believed by some contemporaries to be an imitator of Harrington.

If the above analysis be correct, it would seem that the author has not gone very far in giving new proofs of any definite or original influence of Harrington upon subsequent theory and practice, and that we must still regard the *Oceana* as one of many channels through which ideas from other sources found their way gradually into acceptance in England, America, and France. The book in hand is valuable as a study in comparative political philosophy rather than as a successful study of the influence of political theory upon political practice. It is an interesting study and illuminates the ideas both of Harrington and of those whose views are compared with proposals set forth in the *Oceana*.

F. W. COKER.

A History of Diplomacy in the International Development of Europe.

By DAVID JAYNE HILL, LL.D. Volume III. *The Diplomacy of the Age of Absolutism.* (New York and London: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1914. Pp. xxvi, 706.)

THE third volume of Dr. Hill's solid study of international development extends from 1648 to 1774. The treaties of Westphalia are very properly the starting point because they opened a new era both in the details of international arrangements and in the general conception of the theory of the State. And it is the influence of the changing theory of the State upon the international relations of states which is the author's main underlying thought. In his own words: "In this period, which may be fitly designated as the Age of Absolutism . . . it is not an exaggeration to say, that for more than a hundred years the destinies of Europe were determined by half a dozen men in each generation; and their motives of action were largely personal."

And yet it is impossible to explain this period in terms of purely individual action. The explanation lies in the application of the prevailing theory of the state. He chooses 1774, rather than the more obvious date, 1789, as the end of the period. For he believes that, from the point of view of the theory of the state, the disgraceful and disastrous reign of Louis XV. which closed in 1774 was the death-blow to Absolutism. The attack on it had already begun by philosophers, pamphleteers, and people. Does Sovereignty reside in a single individual or in the entire body of the nation, was already being asked and answered in 1774. Also, from the point of view of international relations, he believes that in the partitions of Poland and Turkey in 1772 and 1774, "force and conspiracy were unblushingly substituted for the idea of law in the relations of sovereign states. . . . By deriving the idea of law from the will of the sovereign, the Age of Absolutism had planted the seeds of international anarchy; and it had only brought forth its natural and inevitable fruit" (p. 674).

In general character this volume is similar to the two preceding ones which have been noticed in earlier numbers of the REVIEW. Its strength lies in the author's discriminating selection of subject-matter, his broad grasp, his careful and conscientious preparation, his wide practical experience in actual diplomacy at several European courts, and his philosophic habit of thought. In rare paragraphs Dr. Hill occasionally allows himself to make general or philosophic observations; these are so well-considered that one wishes there were more of them. On the other hand, it may seem a weakness in his work that he has little or nothing to say of Grotius, Pufendorf, Bynkershoek, Vattel, Moser, and the other writers who were helping to form the rules of international law; likewise, little or nothing of Wicquefort's *L'Ambassadeur et ses Fonctions*, or of the ceremonial and usages of diplomacy; in fact there are many things which one might expect to find in a "History of Diplomacy"

which will be sought in vain here. Such omissions, however, were in accordance with the author's plan, and doubtless conduced to unity of thought and treatment. A more serious weakness, from the historian's point of view, lies in the fact that in narrating diplomatic relations Dr. Hill has not depended primarily on the diplomatic correspondence itself, even where it was easily available in print; he has relied rather on the monographic studies which deal with successive phases of European diplomatic history and has thus sought to make a synthesis of the researches of others. Such a method may serve very well in treating of Brandenburg in the seventeenth century, where he is able to follow two such recent and admirable monographs as those of Waddington and Pagès. But it is less satisfactory, for instance, in discussing the First Partition of Poland, where he is guided by Sorel's *La Question d'Orient au XVIII^e Siècle* and consequently treats it mainly from the French, Prussian, and Turkish sides; invaluable for the Russian side are the diplomatic papers published in the *Sbornik* (easily accessible, because largely written in French though edited in Russian), and the accounts of the preliminaries to the partition in Bilbassoff, *Geschichte Katharina II.*, and Tchetchulin, *The External Politics of Russia in the Beginning of the Reign of Catherine II.* (in Russian).

However, Dr. Hill's third volume is an excellent outline, probably the best in English, of the diplomatic history of Europe during the century and a half before the French Revolution. In so good a book Admiral Tromp should not be allowed to go on sweeping the Channel with a broom nailed to the mast-head (p. 10). It is scarcely true that Carlos II. made his will bequeathing the whole Spanish Succession to the Duke of Anjou because "it was persistently sought by every means within the power of Harcourt", "who pursued this course with the knowledge and approval of Louis XIV." (p. 277). Louis XIV.'s minister, Harcourt, had left Madrid long before the will was made; and Blécourt, who had been left in charge at Madrid, had been instructed by Louis XIV., August 30, 1700, in regard to a possible will: "Vous ne devez faire aucune démarche pour l'obtenir". In fact, Louis was probably intending to adhere to the partition treaty, and Blécourt was so little in touch with what was going on at the bedside of the miserable moribund Carlos, that on October 28, only five days before the will was signed in favor of the Duke of Anjou, he had written to Louis XIV. that the will would be in favor of the Austrian archduke. It was not French diplomacy, but outraged Spanish pride and the hope of preserving unpartitioned the vast Spanish inheritance, which caused the will in favor of Louis XIV.'s grandson. The terms of the treaty of Utrecht (p. 333) and of the Swedish-Prussian treaty of 1720 (p. 394), as given, are not quite correct. The Great Elector was to receive a French subsidy of a hundred thousand livres and not a paltry "ten thousand livres per annum" (p. 160). The King of Poland is more intelligible as Wisniowiecki than "Wienowski" (p. 108); Basnage than "Bosnage" (pp. 122, 167); and Borowski than "Borowsky" (p. 535).

There are very helpful bibliographies at the close of each chapter, and convenient chronological and genealogical tables and maps at the close of the volume.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

Mémoires du Roi Stanislas-Auguste Poniatowski. Tome I. (St. Petersburg: Académie Impériale des Sciences. 1914. Pp. xv, 720.)

FEW men who have played a large rôle in history have had such a mania for writing as did the last King of Poland. Throughout his life he was accustomed to jot down his experiences and his impressions; to keep memoranda of the transactions in which he had participated, the conversations he had had, the speeches he had made; to preserve his tremendously voluminous correspondence. With the aid of this mass of documents, he set out in 1771 to compile his memoirs. The task was frequently interrupted and resumed only after long intervals, so that the bulk of the work was done in the very last years of the king's life. After his death there were found among his papers ten volumes of memoirs covering virtually his whole career except—unfortunately—the period from 1778 to March, 1794. These volumes were sealed up by order of the Emperor Paul and have since reposed in the Russian archives. Their publication, long eagerly awaited by students of Polish history, has now been undertaken, with the support of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, by the Director of the Central Archives of the Empire and of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, M. Sergius Goriainov.

The present volume contains four of the ten "parts" or "volumes", into which the king divided his memoirs. The first deals with his youth and early travels to Vienna, Paris, and London; the second with his famous sojourn in St. Petersburg and his courtship of her who, as he himself says, "was henceforth to be the arbiter of his destiny"; the third relates the events which led up to his accession to the throne; and the fourth describes the gathering storms of that unhappy reign down to the king's abduction by the Confederates of Bar, on the eve of the First Partition.

It must be confessed that these memoirs offer few surprises or revelations. In large part this is due to the fact that during his lifetime the king communicated extensive extracts from his writings to Prince Adam Czartoryski and others, with the result that in 1862 the firm of W. Gerhard in Leipzig was able to publish the well-known *Mémoires secrets et inédits de Stanislas Auguste*, which—although only in the form of fragments, with the text often badly garbled and most uncritically edited—contained most of the striking episodes and important passages from the second and third parts of the work now before us. The same year Żupański in Posen brought forth in the original French and in Polish translation a collection of excerpts somewhat fuller and textually more

correct than the Gerhard edition; and in 1870 J. I. Kraszewski published the first and second parts of the *Memoirs* entire (*Biblioteka pamiętników i podróży po dawnej Polsce*, t. III.). If one adds to all this the fact that many Polish scholars have had access to the papers of Stanislas Augustus preserved in the Czartoryski Museum at Cracow, it is clear that the bulk of the material contained in the present volume was already, in one form or another, known to the world—or at least to that part of the world which reads Polish.

At any rate, we have here for the first time the king's own account of his life in full and authentic form. Owing to the methodical manner of their compilation—with the documentary evidence always close at hand—the *Memoirs* are, in general, accurate and reliable beyond most works of their kind. Occasionally, however, one comes upon a false date or an erroneous statement. For example, the king was certainly wrong in supposing (pp. 505–506) that his election was immediately due to Panin's courage in ordering Kayserlingk to disobey the empress and formally propose Count Poniatowski as Russia's candidate for the throne. The credit belongs to Repnin's bold initiative. And we now know that in the famous affair of the arrest of the Four Members at the Diet of 1767 Repnin was acting in strict accordance with orders from St. Petersburg, although the king asserts quite the contrary (p. 601). What chiefly detracts from the value of the *Memoirs*, however, is their manifestly apologetic character, their tendency to gloss over Stanislas's blunders, their reticences—for instance, with regard to his unavowable transactions with the Russian ambassadors—their exasperating silence on so many subjects. What lends them their chief interest is the light they throw upon the character of a king who was, perhaps, the most intelligent, cultivated, and charming man of his nation, but who was also fatally weak of will, corrupt at heart, and utterly devoid of moral courage and stamina.

R. H. LORD.

Le Maréchal Mortier Duc de Trévise. Par son Petit-neveu le Colonel FRIGNET DESPRÉAUX, de l'Ancien Corps d'État-Major. In two volumes. (Paris and Nancy: Berger-Levrault. 1913–1914. Pp. viii, 453; 477.)

NONE of Napoleon's marshals is less known than Mortier; no serious biography of him has hitherto been attempted. These two large volumes are apparently a small installment of a work which will by its bulk and documentation, if not in other ways, go far to remedy this state of affairs. They have been put together by a relative of the marshal who has had access to the well-stocked family archives, and who has further made appropriate researches among other documents. The book is in fact little more than a series of excerpts from documents, the author's comment being on the whole unimportant.

Mortier left no memoirs, but on the other hand he kept a journal, a dry and brief record of military orders and movements of troops, in fact the dry bones of his professional career. It may be said at once that to judge from the presumably copious extracts from this journal here printed, it is not of great importance for the period included in these volumes, though its evidential value is high, being a record kept by Mortier for his own use and entered at the dates of the events. The journal is supported by documents printed from letter-books containing copies of Mortier's correspondence; these begin to present some valuable features after his appointment to command the Army of Hanover in 1803—that is, the second part of the second volume. There are also some matters of value for Masséna's operations in Switzerland in 1799.

In addition to these family papers Colonel Despréaux has been to the Archives Nationales and to the Ministère de la Guerre, for such documents as bear on the marshal's campaigns. It may be doubted, however, whether his method of selection of these documents has been altogether a good one. He might well have printed those that related directly to Mortier, or again those that related to the campaigns that Mortier fought in and that were hitherto unprinted. He has done neither the one nor the other, but has given us a great mass of matter, nearly all of which is of very slight interest save in relation to the details of the administration of the French army. Very little of it is personal to Mortier, most of it is trivial, and not all of it is unpublished. It refers to the campaigns in the Netherlands, Germany, and Switzerland from 1793 to 1800, in which Mortier participated, and cannot be said to add appreciably to our knowledge of them. It appears probable, however, that with the next volume, which will carry the narrative to the Ulm and Austerlitz campaigns, more valuable material will be reached.

Mortier was reputed the tallest of the marshals, and the most honest; these volumes, including as they do many details of Mortier's administration of Hanover in 1803–1804, confirm the impression of his high integrity. Although he did not come into personal relation with Bonaparte until the Consulate, he was soon an established favorite and was appointed military governor of Paris. Napoleon was nearly a foot shorter than his subordinate and one day this amusing scene occurred. The emperor wanted a book from his shelves which he could not reach. The marshal pulled it down for him, and remarked: “Je suis plus grand que vous, Sire.” “Vous voulez dire de plus haute taille”, retorted the emperor.

Colonel Despréaux gives us no explanation of Mortier's rapid rise in the years 1798–1799. In the former year he was given the 23d Cavalry, having fought his way up steadily since volunteering in 1791. He became a brigadier-general in 1799, was promoted general of division on the battle-field of Zurich by Masséna in the same year, and lieutenant-general, commanding the Army of Hanover, by Bonaparte in 1803. It is the defect of Colonel Despréaux's documents, or of his method, that

too little light is thrown on essential facts, and too much on trivialities. His standard of accuracy is high, however, and he raises considerable hopes that the ensuing volumes may shed valuable light on the campaigns of the empire.

R. M. JOHNSTON.

Le Chartisme, 1830-1848. Par ÉDOUARD DOLLÉANS. In two volumes. (Paris: H. Floury. 1912-1913. Pp. 426; 501.)

THIS is an important book marred by one inexcusable fault; it has neither foot-notes nor bibliography. Particularly inexcusable is this failing in a book which deals in the minute factual knowledge of a field hitherto largely unexplored, and one which the student of social and economic history justly regards as exceedingly fertile and promising. And the real pity of the thing but becomes the more prominent as the genuine merits of the books are disclosed.

Mr. Dolléans has succeeded admirably in analyzing the economic misery in which Chartism found its rootage; the sudden shifting in employment brought about by machinery, the death-struggle of the domestic industries, the introduction of child and female labor, the violent fluctuation in wages and employment—these corollaries of the Industrial Revolution are more clearly and succinctly stated than in any book yet published. Mr. Dolléans has also, with all the epigrammatic wit and clarity of expression which characterize so many of the modern French historians, played his search-light on the rock-bottom explanation of the Chartist movement and of the Chartist failure. He relates, in full detail, the address of one Richard Pilling, a strike leader, before a jury, in which Pilling tells in simplest terms the bitter fight of one man against poverty, the old story of impossible hours, diminishing income, uncertain employment—and the vain attempt of a local strike against the manufacturer. This man, says Dolléans, “représente, mieux qu’ aucun autre, l’ouvrier chartiste, parce qu’ il reste dans sa simplicité malgré ses opinions politiques plus ouvrier que chartiste”. The efforts of the Chartists to get men of this condition in life interested in the Chartist movement are narrated with fullness. The story is vividly told of the competition met with here between Owenite, trade-unionist, and free-trader; and against the latter Mr. Dolléans launches justly his greatest scorn, the encounter between O’Connor and Cobden at Northampton, which he describes, being particularly significant and enlightening to us of the present.

But within the Chartist ranks there are very serious dissensions: the three leaders, Lovett, Bronterre O’Brien, and O’Connor are at loggerheads, divided not only upon tactics, but upon fundamental principles. The sympathies of Mr. Dolléans are decidedly with O’Connor and the physical force Chartists. He satirically refers to Lovett as “consecrating himself to popular education and school books for children”, and

holds that his willingness to compromise with the middle classes, as evinced by his attitude toward the free-traders and the non-conformist interests, was detrimental to the Chartist cause. Bronterre O'Brien also is attacked. He is scornfully called "a schoolmaster" and "a man of theory", although certainly it must be conceded that O'Brien's idea of land nationalization was more practical than O'Connor's land-bank scheme. Between O'Brien and O'Connor there was much bad blood and Mr. Dolléans, on the face of the evidence, seems over-anxious to champion the latter. O'Brien's objections to a permanent convention were assuredly not without reason, and his refusal to take part in the last great Chartist demonstration is at least made in manly fashion. This book does not do him justice.

There are a few minor errors of fact in *Le Chartisme*, such as the statement (I. 167) that Richard Oastler had made and lost a large fortune. More serious is the omission of certain discussions that one expects to find in such an elaborate piece of scholarship, as for instance: the relations of the Chartists with Alexander Carlyle and the other very considerable group of British free-thinkers the radicalism of whose ideas certainly extended to political and economic matters; the relations of the Chartists to the British republicans, of whose publication and propaganda there is no mention in this book. One would also like to know more of Ernest Jones, the Chartist poet, and the substitution of some of his stirring verse for the long harangues of O'Connor would have been profitable. But more serious than this is the suspicion that Mr. Dolléans has trusted far too confidently to the columns of the *North Star*, O'Connor's organ. The *North Star* is the one great source constantly mentioned in the body of the narrative—and the *North Star* was a very biassed sheet. But without foot-notes how can we be very sure just what Mr. Dolléans's sources have been?

Yet, in the last analysis, this book is exceedingly valuable. It brings to light many interesting if not hitherto unknown facts among which may be put: the intimate relation of the Chartist movement to the international radicalism of 1848, and also the abortive but none the less significant attempt to include woman suffrage as an integral part of the Chartist propaganda. Furthermore, Mr. Dolléans has beautifully and clearly demonstrated that Chartism was essentially an economic not a political agitation.

WALTER P. HALL.

Historisch-Politische Aufsätze und Reden. Von HERMANN ONCKEN. In two volumes. (Munich and Berlin: R. Oldenbourg. 1914. Pp. vi, 344; ii, 382.)

FEW recent volumes by German historians possess the interest for students of contemporary history that these two volumes of essays and speeches have. The greater part of the first volume is directly related

to the literature of the more conservative Pan-Germanists; the bulk of the second deals with the preliminaries of the formation of the empire from 1848 to 1871. The first volume contains an eloquent eulogy of the Kaiser (1913); the Ideas of 1813 and of the present (1913); the United States and the Great Powers; "das Deutschamerikanertum"; Germany and Austria since 1871; a biography of the historian, economist, and agitator, Schäffle; Germany and England: the increase of the army or of the fleet (before the Heidelberg branch of the Navy League, 1912); an essay on Nationality; one on "Politics, History, and Public Opinion"; and two long essays on Sebastian Frank, the historian of the sixteenth century. The second volume contains six essays on various aspects of Bismarck's life, and sketches of Grand Duke Peter of Oldenburg, Count Alexander Keyserling, Bennigsen, Ludwig Bamberger, von Roggenbach, Freytag, Camphausen, Mevissen, Reichensperger, Marx, and Engels.

These biographical essays, several of which were originally book reviews, some of which were memorial addresses, others of which were papers read before societies more or less learned, can hardly be said to add greatly to our store of information, but they abound in pithy restatements of views, in the evidences of clear vision, and contain lengthy appreciations of such important books as Von Sybel's *Begründung des Deutschen Reiches* and evaluations of certain collections of material which the student will find useful.

But the essays and speeches in the first volume are those upon which Oncken himself has wished to lay particular emphasis, and which are to-day, because of subsequent events, of the greater interest. They are, of course, propaganda rather than history, opinion rather than research, but they give an excellent notion of the political propaganda at the great universities in the last ten years, and show the extent to which the teaching of history has been a part of the political and national movement. The essays seek, says Oncken in his preface, "to throw the light of historical knowledge upon subjects which hitherto were left in the river of partisan quarrels", "to arouse political parties to a stronger consciousness of their historical place in the national life", and "to place the political debates of the nation upon a foundation of historical knowledge". The historian who eventually attempts to trace the development of the militarist spirit in Germany, its relation to public opinion, and the methods of the government to proselytize through the schools and universities, will find much interesting material in these speeches and essays, for they leave little doubt that Oncken has played something better than a subordinate part. The fact alone that he was selected to give these patriotic addresses is significant and invests his statements with something more than the weight of his own learning.

The two most unusual and important chapters are those upon American foreign policy, the growth of the Monroe Doctrine, of Imperialism, and upon the German migration to America and "Deutschamerikaner-

tum". These occupy nearly a third of the first volume. He sees in the Monroe Doctrine, Imperialism; in the Pan-American Congress of 1826 anything but a "peace-conference". "What seems to be a strong renunciation of European politics means, however, no renunciation of policies of Imperialistic conquest. . . . The difference lay simply in the fact that this expansion henceforth had nothing to fear from Europe, but could extend itself in all directions without European opposition at the expense of non-European powers." "Peace on Earth and *Our Interests*—this conjunction of visions of world's peace and schemes of world conquest we recognize already in Jefferson's first policies as the key (*Leitmotiv*) of a specious American foreign policy, and we find it again in the theories of the founder of the Monroe Doctrine." American policy differed from that of European powers not so much in purpose as in opportunity. He compares Mahan and Roosevelt to Droysen and Treitschke, Seeley and Froude. Mahan's books, he thinks, had "an effect upon public opinion comparable to that of the German Navy League". In Roosevelt he sees a man "moved by the great propelling force of American Expansion", inspired by "a national Idealism" and by the consciousness of the need of a national ethical impulse. He, too, is full of the "specious cant" of American foreign policy, and this enabled him, "one of the strongest nationalists of the present day", to receive the Nobel Prize.

In conclusion, he says, "In the first rank of conquering world powers is the Union now to be found. But the further it progresses along this road, the more it will be drawn into the net of world antagonisms, the more it will be compelled to take sides with the great coalitions, and the more it will lose the early peculiarity of continental isolation with all its advantages in an age in which the Great Powers and their dependencies stretch around the globe."

He traces with some sorrow the progress of the amalgamation of the Germans into the American people, and looks forward to the growth of "a powerful public opinion, when the Germans, side by side with the Irish, react strongly against the natural English-American alliance, when they insist that America is an English-speaking country, but not of English but of mixed culture, not of English but of mixed blood". He lauds the foundation of a strong society in America to place German side by side with English in the instruction of the public schools, and to foster German-American history as part of a new national life. Germans in Germany "must become conscious that over there, in Deutsch-amerikanertum, lies a part of the organism of the German people, which belongs to our national being". Of the actual reality of this Germany in America, he admits no doubt. Such utterances shed a flood of light upon German ideas about America and American conditions.

ROLAND G. USHER.

The Balkans: a Laboratory of History. By WILLIAM M. SLOANE, Professor of History, Columbia University. (New York: Eaton and Mains; Cincinnati: Jennings and Graham. 1914. Pp., viii, 322.)

It cannot be said that this book is happy in either its title or its subtitle, for, to the expectant spirit of the present reviewer at least, the title seemed to promise something like a history of the Balkans, while the subtitle suggested that the offering would be in the nature of a series of seminar studies educing from Balkan examples some general principles of historical development. That nothing was farther from the author's mind than a book along such lines is frankly avowed in the preface, where we read that the present volume is composed of essays contributed some years ago to the *Political Science Quarterly* and recently rewritten in the light of the great Balkan conflict of 1912 and 1913. The author also informs us—and the vivacity of his text fully confirms the announcement—that he has been a frequent visitor of the steaming witch's-caldron of the southeast corner of Europe and that his pages record actual impressions received while adventurously sampling its changing sights and savors. If these circumstances of composition could have been suggested in the title the reader would have been spared a certain disillusionment; he would not have judged a collection of essays by the literary standards of a book and he would not have been constantly irritated by the absence of internal coherence and of unity of design. The author himself, impressed with the difficulty of making his traveller's views and discussions carry professional authority, was at pains to bind them together with a little historical cement. But the result is not encouraging. The first chapter, covering the long period from the coming of the Turks to the reign of Sultan Abdul Hamid, moves at such lightning speed that the whole mass of events runs into an indistinguishable blur. And when on later occasions some present-day issue is illuminated by opening a limited vista into the past the statement of fact frequently leaves much to be desired. There is no evidence that Stephan Dushan died while assaulting Constantinople (p. 68); Bulgarian beginnings go back far beyond the twelfth century (p. 126); it is a mistake to tell the story of the fall of Alexander of Battenberg in such a way as to leave the impression that the patriotic party got rid of him (p. 129); the *zupanate* was certainly not "a type of monarchy established by a certain Stephan" (p. 134); and neither the Servian church nor the Servian peasants are recognizable in the misstatements' (pp. 134–135) intended to describe them. Everything considered, the historical background vouchsafed us by the author is slight and unreliable.

After this perhaps undue emphasis on what the book is not, it is right and proper to insist that as a discussion of the many contemporary problems vexing the Balkan world the volume has high merit and is

touched at all times with that liveliness which is bred of first-hand knowledge. In these problems too one could wish for more order and a better co-ordination, but at least the crucial topics are all broached and the evidence marshalled with information, breadth of view, and sympathetic understanding. In regard to the ethnology of the Balkans the author shares the opinion that the traditional theories as to the origin of the peoples of the southeast are all in the melting-pot; the doctrine of pure races, above all, invites his amused derision (ch. III.). The moral sham of the much bandied catch-words nationality and pan-Slavism is exposed, and Balkan federation, past and future, treated with that touch of cynicism which continued occupation with Balkan affairs imposes on the gentlest spirits. The atrocity charges of the recent war are examined with judicial calm (ch. VIII.), the future development of Bulgarians, Serbs, Rumanians, and Greeks subjected to a kindly analysis, and with the tentative air of a rather weary scholarship the book offers as the upshot of so many pages of travail the mild conclusion: "In particular the dogma that nationality, ecclesiasticism, and consanguinity are the foundations of political efficiency has been discredited."

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Cyclopedia of American Government. Edited by ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN, A. M., LL. B., LL. D., Professor of History, University of Chicago, and ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, Ph. D., Litt. D., LL. D., Professor of the Science of Government, Harvard University. In three volumes. (New York and London: D. Appleton and Company. 1914. Pp. xxxiv, 732; vi, 773; v, 785.)

THIS work was planned and projected about four years ago. It now appears as the matured product of nearly 250 contributors who have co-operated under the editorial guidance of two well-known students of history, government, and law, Professor McLaughlin of the University of Chicago and Professor Hart of Harvard. No one can scan its comprehensive plan without conviction that the work was designed to meet a wide range of needs among those who desire to know something about the present and past workings of government. While the plan is not an imitation of any known to the reviewer, the work itself bears a likeness to such well-tested books of reference as Lalor's *Cyclopaedia of Political Science, Political Economy, and of the Political History of the United States* (3 vols., 1881-1884), Conrad's *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften* (third ed., 8 vols., 1909-1911), Maurice Block's *Dictionnaire Général de la Politique* (2 vols., 1873-1874), Cerboni's *Enciclopedia di Amministrazione di Industrie e Commercio* (5 vols., 1891-1904), and even to Palgrave's *Dictionary of Political Economy* (3 vols., and Appendix, 1901-1908). These are all works specially useful to students

of modern government. They differ in the emphasis placed upon its manifold factors.

The term Government in this latest of reference works has been interpreted in a sense broad enough to comprehend much of what Lalor and his collaborators meant by political science, political economy, political history, and biography. But the editors, while extending the field of biography so as to include a larger number of names (*circa* 220), have reduced political history to a narrower range, and have limited political science and economics to such theoretical and practical phases as bear relations more or less direct to the actualities of present-day American ideals, practices, and institutions. Greater attention has been given to topics in constitutional and international law and diplomacy; to topics in local (state, county, and municipal) government; and to a multiplicity of topics in the wide field of public effort for and regulation of the popular welfare. Extra-legal practices and party devices have been considered at such length as to make it clear that the editors have not forgotten the maxim familiar to readers of John Stuart Mill: in politics, as in mechanics, the power which is to keep the engine going must be sought for *outside* the machinery.

In the three volumes there are some 2890 topics separately treated by, approximately, 245 contributors. Of these contributors quite two-thirds are teachers by profession; the remaining third, of about eighty names, is made up of writers, experts, and men of affairs, many of whom have had actual experience in positions of administrative responsibility both in and outside government circles. The experience and qualifications to write on special topics of such men as Rear-Admiral Chadwick, E. Dana Durand, Gaillard Hunt, Francis E. Leupp, S. N. D. North, James Brown Scott, Thorvald Solberg, Lawrence Veiller, and Charles D. Walcott are too well known to need comment. But it is not on the shoulders of such men that the burdens of contribution have rested. Of the total number of topics, more than 2320 were prepared by only fifty contributors. Among these contributors Professor O. C. Hornell of Bowdoin College stands first in number of topics (*c.* 288), most of them very brief explanations of political terms or definitions of political slang phrases. Professor Hart is next with about 212 topics, twenty-seven of these notably long, and all of them revealing extraordinary variety of interest—a veritable gamut from such subjects as Abolitionists, Art Schools, Conservation, Influence in Government, to Vice Commissions, Vice-President, and an explanation of the sobriquet “Watch-Dog of the Treasury”. Add to these two names the following five: Professors Davis R. Dewey (*c.* 184 topics), William MacDonald (*c.* 180), McLaughlin (*c.* 106), Judge Emlin McClain (*c.* 101), and Professor G. G. Wilson (*c.* 93)—and we have the seven most hard-worked members of the staff. As giving a still clearer view of the better quality of effort that has been utilized to so large an extent in the work, one might name—somewhat at random but with reference to numbers of topics in a de-

scending scale—Professors Jesse Macy (c. 64), W. B. Munro (c. 49), J. W. Garner (c. 44), J. A. Fairlie (c. 43), W. W. Willoughby (c. 36), J. M. Callahan (c. 32), P. J. Treat (c. 32), E. H. Vickers (c. 30), J. R. Commons (c. 26), C. A. Beard (c. 22), J. S. Reeves (c. 15), W. F. Willoughby (c. 15), C. H. Van Tyne (c. 14), and F. J. Stimson (c. 13). Not one of the fifty contributors just referred to has prepared fewer than twelve topics. Contrasted to these first fifty are the eighty names that stand for one contribution apiece. It should be clear, then, that about 115 contributors have had the comparatively light task of providing the remainder, or approximately 500 topics. The professor of colonial history at Oxford, Hugh E. Egerton, is the sole foreign contributor. Six women have expounded eight topics.

Turning from contributors to form, scope, and content: the longer and more important topics to the number of 350 are given prominence by titles running, at the outset of the articles, across the double-columned pages—"treatise" articles they are termed by the editors. These treatise articles, not confined to matter-of-fact statements, are designed as more or less discursive essays on a variety of themes. In the course of such articles authors have occasionally forgotten that a cyclopedia is an adjunct to, not a principal of, learning, and that debatable or controversial matter should have no place. Among articles of this type, varying much in merit, but notably long, are three by the senior editor, two of these consecutive articles on Boundaries of the United States, Exterior and Interior (I. 150-166, including maps), the third on Presidential Elections (III. 8-46, with tables); an article on the Democratic Party (I. 565-576) by Professor MacDonald; an article on Political Science by Professor J. W. Jenks, followed by a group on Political Theories (II. 713-732) by Dr. James Sullivan, Professors W. W. Willoughby and H. A. Yeomans; Population of the United States (II. 739-757, including maps and tables) by Dr. North; the Republican Party (III. 189-201) by Professor Woodburn; and an article on Suffrage (III. 443-457, with elaborate tables) by Professor G. H. Haynes. About thirty of the forty-eight articles on the history and governments of the separate states of the Union take this treatise form. I have noted others in the same class, carefully considered, well written, and sure to prove helpful to students of historic problems: two excellent articles by Professor Roscoe Pound of Harvard on Codification (I. 302-305) and Jurisprudence (II. 264-268); Commercial Policy and Relations of the United States (I. 339-344) by Professor Clive Day of Yale; an informing treatment of the Committee System in the United States (I. 355-360) by Mr. Charles Moore of Detroit; Political Parties in Congress, 1789-1913 (I. 388-392) by Professor T. C. Smith of Williams; two in particular by Professor McLaughlin on Courts and Unconstitutional Legislation (I. 508-510) and Place and Significance of Party (II. 640-644); a thoroughly fresh and informing exposition by Professor Allen Johnson of Yale of the Democratic-Republican Party, 1792-1828 (I. 576-581); three articles by

Professor F. J. Turner of Harvard (his only contributions) setting forth in brief compass his well-known views on the Frontier in American Development (II. 61-64), on Sectionalism (III. 280-285), and on the West as a Factor in American Politics (III. 668-675); a group of articles by Professor Macy of Grinnell on sundry phases of Party Government (II. 620 ff.); and finally an article—one of several on the same general theme scattered through the volumes and all done by the same writer, Professor Treat of Stanford University—on Public Lands and Land Policy (III. 93-97).

It is of course impossible in limited space to do more than suggest the variety of topics, minor and major, that mark still further the character of the work. The very numbers of topics grouped under such subjects as Banks and Banking (18), Constitution, Constitutional, Constitutions (20), County (12), Courts (24), Education (16), Schools (31), Indian (8), Labor (14), Law (12), Legislation and Legislatures (12), Parties and Party (16), State and States (21), Tax (13), Taxation (12), Taxes, (6)—these may reveal the direction of certain well-analyzed themes more or less intensively set forth. Nothing corresponds to that remarkable series of articles on American history prepared by the late Alexander Johnston for Lalor's *Cyclopaedia*, a series which occupied about a fifth of that work. But American history—interpreted from the pragmatic standpoint and chiefly since the colonial period—has been dwelt upon with respect to such features as Colonization, the Revolution, the framing and establishment of the Constitution, the democratic forces of the Jackson epoch and of later times, Slavery, the Negro Problem, the Civil War, the Confederacy, Reconstruction, and Expansion. Judge McClain and a few other contributors have analyzed briefly a good many leading cases in law from the days of the Parson's Cause (1763) to the Northern Securities case of 1904 or later. Of the biographical sketches, about a fifth (*i. e.*, 45) are of living men. More than 160 of such sketches—all varying slightly in length—have been prepared by Professor MacDonald. Some hundreds of political terms, slang phrases, and stray words have been briefly defined or explained. "Jingoes", "Roorback", "Quids", "Stalwarts", and the like, may be worth while. But when it comes to "Bar'l", "Back from Elba" (1910), "Dago", "Junket", "Kid-Glove Politics", "Radio-Telegraphy", "Sorehead", "Stampede", "Still-Hunt", "Tidal-Wave", and others, I venture to think that the space might have been used to better purposes, for the numbers of such expressions or terms are countless; many of them call for no explanation; their presence here satisfies chiefly the demand for what the Germans style *Unterhaltungslektüre*.

The essential features of government in the Dominion of Canada have been fittingly entrusted to such men as Professors G. M. Wrong, Stephen Leacock, W. B. Munro, and Mr. Edward Porritt. In view of half a dozen capable students in the United States of Latin-American history and conditions, it is surprising to find one writer alone responsible for

some twenty topics on the outline aspects of government in Latin-American countries, although Professors J. H. Latané, H. E. Bolton, and Chester L. Jones have contributed the articles on our diplomatic relations with these countries. Professor Goodnow has handled the general theme, Administration in Europe. Various experts have been utilized to treat our diplomatic relations with Asia and Africa as well as with many of the leading states in Europe, with China, Japan, the Near East, Liberia, the Barbary States, the Pacific Islands, etc. Australia in its federated aspect, the Union of South Africa, the Hanseatic League, the Holy Roman Empire, and the Influence of Rome on Modern Government are topics touched upon with comparative brevity. Greater attention is paid to Parliament, the House of Commons, and local government in Great Britain.

There is an air of authenticity about printed matter, especially when such matter is found between the covers of a dictionary or cyclopedia as promising-looking as this, that amounts almost to sanctity. The casual reader, the inexperienced student, the school-teacher, and often the hurried man-of-affairs, give credit to such material with seldom a moment's hesitation or doubt. Credit is strengthened by the mere sight of a bibliographical note appended to a topic. The names of many contributors to these volumes carry assurance of much conscientious effort and care. Occasional typographical errors must occur even with the utmost precaution on the part of scrupulous editors, painstaking printers and publishers. No amount of inept chatter from reviewers is likely seriously to affect the value of such a work provided due attention has been given to the manifold particulars of which wisdom consists. Has this sort of attention been given?

As it stands, much of the work reveals what Mr. H. G. Wells has recently termed "the vice of second-rate energetic". Neither editor seems to have had time to look with adequate care to details. Errors in typography glare at one, beginning with names, initials, and titles in the list of contributors and extending to the close of the third volume. Narrative, titles of books, especially dates—all suffer at various points. There are rather more than 2200 pages of text. In these pages there are certainly twice that number of errors. Accents on foreign names or on the words of titles in foreign languages are sometimes correct, but are just as likely to be wrong. The well-informed reader may overlook such errors as "Prudhon" for Proudhon (I. 41), "E. V." for G. von Zenker (I. 41), "G. T." for J. P. Gordy (I. 48), G. "Sselle" for Scelle, author of *La Traite Nègrière*, not *Negrière* (I. 84), "Story" for Storey (I. 93), "Eugene" for Émile Dupuy (I. 122), "1 Vesey J . . . 1" for 1 Vesey, Sr. . . . 194 (I. 166), "De Toucqueville" (I. 403), "Ordinanzes" for Ordenanzas (II. 22), "H. V." for A. von Schwartz (II. 39), C. "Illbert" (II. 615), Thomas More "(1608-1674)" for (1478-1535), II. 724, or even "H. A. Hilary" for Hilary A. Herbert (III. 82) and "John Ward . . . of Agawams" for Nathaniel Ward of Aggawam

(III. 253). But in most of the following instances of error, I have had to resort to the aid of several obliging experts in bibliographical lore in order to resolve the mysteries: "W. H. Ewin" for Major W. H. Emory, "W. Fitzwilliam Martin" for William Fitzwilliam, Viscount Milton, M. P. (I. 159), L. N. "Wheaton" for Whealton, "'Massachusetts and New York Boundary Line' . . . in xix (1906)" for Massachusetts and New Hampshire Boundary-Line Controversy in vol. xliii (1909), 77-88 (I. 166), "U. S. Dept. of State, *Passport*" for a government publication entitled *The American Passport: its History* (1898), by Gaillard Hunt (I. 273), and "R. G. Boone" for C. F. Thwing (I. 634). The name of former Secretary of Agriculture Norman J. Colman is insistently allowed to stand as "Coleman". Henry "Stanberry", "Edward" for Edwards Pierrepont, Amos T. "Ackerman", and Wayne "McVeagh" (I. 95) mar a list, in several other respects not above criticism, of attorneys-general of the United States. In this connection attention should be called to one error likely to do injustice, if it is not noted, to one of the careful contributors to the work: the good article on the Federalist Party (I. 721-725), attributed to "H. M. B." (initials of two contributors), was written by Professor Allen Johnson of Yale.

The following comments are intended to suggest a few useful as well as a good many questionable features: (i) *Chart of the Internal Organization of the Department of Agriculture* (I. 16-17): one of ten similar aids, all undated and without evidence of authenticity. The positions of assistant-secretary and assistant-chief of the Weather Bureau misleading; several other details questionable. The *Chart of the Department of Commerce* (I. 335) reveals a non-existent Division of Publications in the Bureau of the Census. Previous to 1909 such a division was under the chief-clerk (not the director) of the Census Bureau, but has since then been consolidated with the Division of Revision and Results. *Chart of the Interior Department* (II. 200-201): the four divisions set down under the Topographic Branch belong properly to the Geologic Branch of the Geological Survey. *Chart of Department of Justice* (II. 272) substantially correct, but gives erroneous idea of the very variable assignments to subordinates. *Chart of Post-Office Department* (II. 762), quite the best in the work. (ii) *Cabinet Members* (I. 195-198): an excellent list, in most essentials reliable. The name of T. M. T. McKennan, secretary of the Interior from August 15 to 26, 1850, has been omitted. The statement (p. 195) that elsewhere in the work "all *ad interim* appointments even for a day or two" will be found is misleading. Without the use of manuscript sources, no more accurate lists than those in Mosher's *Executive Register* (1903) have been compiled, and Mosher's lists have not been carefully followed (see lists: Secretaries of Agriculture (correct), I. 20; of Interior, II. 199; of Navy, II. 506; of State, III. 402; of Treasury, III. 565-566; of War, III. 648-649; of Attorneys-General, I. 95; of Postmasters-General, II. 766-767). The articles on the various Departments will be found useful, but those written by Mr. G. Hunt and Mr. A. P.

Andrew respectively on the State Department (III. 378-381) and the Treasury Department (III. 560-564) quickly show how advantageous to writers is familiarity with actual working conditions. (iii) *Exterior Boundaries* (I. 150-159): well conceived, carelessly written and put together. Not a word about a crucial provision of the Jay treaty for the adjustment of the St. Croix boundary or about the important treaty of 1908 concerning the Canadian international boundary (*Treaties and Conventions*, ed. Malloy, I. 815-827). Misinterpretation of ground of our claim to the possession of Long Island and neighboring waters (p. 151). There are no "San Juan Islands lying in Puget Sound" (p. 153). Uninformed statements about "Mars Hill" (p. 155). Confusing and misleading paragraph on the Alaska Land Boundary (p. 157). A single good map and several careful diagrams to which references could be made in the narrative should replace the six mediocre maps to which no reference is made. Bibliography of twenty-six references ill arranged, the single really useful work on the topic (J. B. Moore's *International Arbitrations*, I.) being found near its close. (iv) *Turkish Capitulations* (I. 228-229): hardly adequate, for the three periods of this subject, marked by three dates (1535, 1740, 1856) are not clearly set forth. The leading recent work (G. Pélissié du Rausas, *Le Régime des Capitulations dans l'Empire Ottoman*, second ed., 1910) is not mentioned in the list of references. (v) *Drago Doctrine* (I. 610-612): excellent in every way except for typographical errors in bibliography. Inasmuch as the Calvo Doctrine appears in connection with all concessions acquired by United States capitalists investing in Latin-American countries, a topic might well have been devoted to it. (vi) *Educational Statistics* (I. 647-650): accurate tables accompanying a useful article. (vii) *Public Aid to Expositions* (I. 700-701): thoroughly misleading, for the figures on which its value depends are chiefly remarkable for their variation from even an approximation to the facts. I base my judgment on a comparison with the figures drawn from official sources for the use of members of Congress on exactly this topic and compiled under date of December 29, 1910, by the Division of Bibliography of the Library of Congress, the summary never, probably, having been printed. (viii) *Illiteracy* (II. 142): based on the statistics of the Twelfth Census of 1900, some of which were misread. Entirely unreliable. (ix) *Impeachment* (II. 149-151): a painstaking analysis and clear exposition likely to prove useful. (x) *Robert R. Livingston* (II. 361): three palpable misstatements in one short paragraph. (xi) *Population of the United States* (II. 739-757): an excellent article. The eight leading maps would be more significant had they been accredited to their probable source, the *Statistical Atlas* for 1900, and the "Report on Population" for 1910. The variation in shading, carefully reproduced on the map on page 752, which throws it strangely out of accord with the others in the series, was originally due to an error by a draughtsman in the Census Bureau and might easily have been remedied, had inquiry been made there by the editors.

(xii) *Public Records* (III. 107-108): an unsatisfactory treatment. A record, in government parlance, is something recorded or copied in contradistinction to something filed. Files are the communications to the department, the records communications from it, although the latter term is loosely applied to both sorts of matter. Why should not a work on government explain such interpretations? British archive-management in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is unduly praised in comparison with Continental. (xiii) *Table of Salaries* (III. 247-249): the absence of date and authorities for this leaves one free to guess that it was compiled largely from the *Official Register of the United States* for 1911. With respect to a good many items it is now out of date; but even in 1911 the Comptroller of the Currency was not paid a salary of \$12,000. (xiv) *Political Satirists* (III. 253): carelessly written and uninformed. The reference to "Cooper" as a "personal journalist" in the group with William Cobbett and James T. Callender, probably refers to Thomas Cooper (1759-1840), scientist, friend of Dr. Joseph Priestley, and president for many years of the College of South Carolina. John Trumbull, author of *McFingal* (1774; 1782), certainly should have been referred to. But why were not the *Biglow Papers* and their author named? Instead, after listing such names as Artemas Ward, Petroleum V. Nasby, and Orpheus C. Kerr, the writer says: "They were followed by E. L. Godkin, the editor of the *Nation*, an unterrified dissector of his opponents. . . . Since 1890 the field has been taken by Wallace Irwin . . . and by 'Mr. Dooley'". (xv) *Secretary to the President* (III. 280): a useful topic, had it been well treated. There have been upwards of forty such secretaries, whose names (with dates of their services) should have been accurately given. As it stands, there is almost nothing to it which is not the veriest commonplace.

The index (III. 707-785) is adequate. Because of heavy calendered paper, the volumes are needlessly heavy. The type used in the text is 8-point, the same that was used in Lalor's *Cyclopaedia*. But the matter in this new work is less, by about 750 pages, than is to be found in Lalor. It may be recalled that Lalor provided no index.

HENRY BARRETT LEARNED.

Guide to the Materials for American History, to 1783, in the Public Record Office of Great Britain. Volume II. Departmental and Miscellaneous Papers. By Charles M. Andrews, Farnam Professor of American History, Yale University. (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington. 1914. Pp. viii, 427.)

THE appearance of this volume marks the completion of a notable series of guides to the sources in British repositories bearing on American colonial and Revolutionary history. The first volume was devoted to the papers in the British Museum, Bodleian Library, and other places outside the great central archive building. Two volumes embrace the

papers in the Public Record Office, one covering mainly the Colonial Office papers and the other now before us the departmental and miscellaneous papers.

The same high qualities which attach to the first volumes are equally characteristic of the last. Sound scholarship, expert knowledge, and the expenditure of much time and patient energy are very evident in the work. Every practical aid seems to have been devised to facilitate the approach to the vast, unworked mines of raw materials, affording the searcher opportunity to husband his time and strength. The content, character, and value of the sources are described in general in some cases, in others the contents are listed in detail. At every appropriate place there is inserted a brief account of the features and practices peculiar to a particular office, thus throwing light on the nature of the archives. The introductions, covering the history of the various executive agencies, their structure, procedure, functions, archives, and their relations one to the other and to colonial business, constitute a background of the greatest service to one who uses the records and in themselves are important contributions to the literature of English government and imperial administration.

At least one-half the guide is allotted to the records of the two great executive boards of the Admiralty and Treasury. The papers of the War Office, Commissariat, and Paymaster-General, and of the High Court of Admiralty each cover about forty pages; the Customs Board and Declared Accounts each about twenty. The few remaining pages are sufficient for the records of the Lord Chamberlain, Modern Board of Trade, and a few special collections of private papers. In point of time the sources bear largely on the eighteenth century, particularly the period 1740-1783. British colonial control did not assume full and definite shape till after 1700 and the period of the last French wars and the revolt of the colonies naturally called into fullest play the activities of the great executive departments. In point of content the records bring into view the great imperial problems of defense, finance in all its varied aspects, trade, administration both in England and in the colonies. It is a rich and abundant aggregate of raw material, hardly touched, and concerned with a period and side of American colonial history barely treated. When this mass of material has been worked through, analyzed, and presented by scholarly investigators, then we shall know something of the nature, the scope, and the spirit of British imperial policies and of the relations of the colonies to the parent country.

The work of Dr. Jameson and the group of able and scholarly associates in elaborating guides to the material in foreign archives for our history is a sure sign that we are coming to a study of the past with a new vision. Too frequently our history has been written as if American life, problems, and growth were somehow unaffected by and unconnected with the main currents of the world's history. A reaction has set in and undoubtedly the work of exploring and charting foreign archives

is one of the important forces weakening the older attitude of isolation. The Spanish War brought us new duties abroad and we became conscious of our relations with the other great political communities. Great interest was promptly recruited in the subjects of colonies, sea-power, world commerce, and politics. In the year of that war Professors Andrews and Osgood in timely and noteworthy papers deprecated the customary narrowness displayed by writers of our colonial era and dwelt upon the need of taking an angle of observation broad enough to comprehend the colonies in their imperial connection. To this cause Professor Andrews has done a service of inestimable value. His great work as guide-maker alone entitles him to the highest praise. By his writing, teaching, and kindly counsel to others he has done much to give impulse, direction, and shape to the movement designed to bring to light and to correlate and balance the three great factors in our early history, the colonies, the mother-country, and the relations between them.

W. T. ROOT.

A History of Connecticut: its People and Institutions. By GEORGE L. CLARK. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1914. Pp. xx, 609.)

HISTORIES, especially state histories, have been presented recently in so condensed a form that we welcome as a step in the right direction the generous dimensions of this volume, in which the author has felt willing and able to allow himself the space of 609 octavo pages for the treatment of his subject.

It is true that when the volume is examined much is found that is usually furnished by a gazetteer, or a magazine of local history, but there is nothing that is not covered by the title and the evident purpose of the book—to present the history, not only of the state of Connecticut, but also of its people and its institutions. Since J. R. Green set the fashion, we have become accustomed to having histories contain much more than were formerly considered strictly historical facts, and the author of the present volume has been gratifyingly liberal in his interpretation of the functions of an historian.

The strictly historical work of the volume is well done. Mr. Clark has handled his authorities independently, has followed good writers upon special subjects as well as being familiar with the previous historians, and has been fortunate in his critics, whose help he acknowledges most fully. It is perhaps unfortunate that his work preceded in its appearance Dr. De Loss Love's most careful and scholarly *History of Hartford*, which has laid at rest forever the ancient fallacy of the creation of the commonwealth by the union of existing towns, and has pointed out most clearly the relation of the settlement of Connecticut to the "Lords and Gentlemen" who were grantees under the Warwick Patent.

Mr. Clark treads warily however, and admits that the basis of the Provisional Government "was the assumed consent of the grantees under the alleged Warwick Patent, represented by John Winthrop Jr., rather than on any inherent authority of the Massachusetts Bay Colony".

In his treatment of colonial history, Mr. Clark is most conservative. The Charter Oak and its history are given as undisputed facts. "Priest" Peters receives his customary berating for his witty *jeu d'esprit* known as the *History of Connecticut*. The history of the Andros "usurpation" adopts Trumbull's invectives unquestioned. The author is fair and moderate in what he has to say about the treatment of the Quakers and the witches. It is true that Quakers were not ill used in the colony of Connecticut proper, though they suffered great hardships in New Haven and at Southold, but they were everywhere denied the common rights and privileges of Englishmen. The witchcraft delusion was, as the author says most truly, no worse in New England than in the mother-country, and Connecticut was disgraced with no such bloodthirsty panic as occurred in the Bay Colony. There was enough of it, however, to disgust modern citizens of Connecticut with the superstitious intolerance of their ancestors, and all that can be said in extenuation is, that they were not as bad as others.

The author is impartial in his theological comments. He holds up the Saybrook Platform and the Half-Way Covenant to abhorrence, and he tells the story of the expulsion of the Yale undergraduates who attended a New Light meeting in their vacation. He is strictly fair in his account of the dethronement of the "Standing Order" in the peaceful revolution of 1818.

The limits of a review will not allow a discussion of what is indeed a characteristic part of the work, the history of manners and of industry. It is, perhaps, sufficient to say that the work contains a great deal of curious and interesting information, and it may be recommended to those who desire to come into sympathetic familiarity with the manners and customs, past and present, of the denizens of Connecticut from the "huge reptiles and the terrible mastodon" down to the monster enterprises of the New Connecticut.

A History of the National Capital, from its Foundation through the Period of the Adoption of the Organic Act. By WILHELMUS BOGART BRYAN. Volume I. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. xv, 669.)

THE City of Washington is the National Capital; that is the most comprehensive description that can be given of it; but to call it the National Capital is to call it by its descriptive title instead of its name. This book ought to have been called a History of the City of Washington. It comes up to the year 1814 and is to be followed by at least one other volume. The chief sources of material are, besides those works

which are generally accessible, several manuscript collections in Washington—the Papers of the Continental Congress in the Library of Congress, the District of Columbia Papers in the State Department, the papers in the office of the Commissioner of Public Buildings and Grounds in the War Department, the Thornton, Henley-Smith, Washington, Jefferson, and Stoddert papers in the Library of Congress, the early city records, and a number of obscure local imprints which contain valuable information concerning the city. The publications of the Columbia Historical Society, which Mr. Bryan has used freely, have brought to light a great deal of valuable data which would have been hidden if that society had not been formed.

Mr. Bryan's research has been conscientious and his style is unpretentious. He obtrudes no so-called historical discoveries and he holds no brief for a particular character. The result is that we feel confidence in his work. The book discloses greater research and industry, however, than skill in historical treatment, and some matters of supreme importance in the history of the city are treated as if they were of subordinate interest. For example, the bargain between Jefferson and Hamilton was the immediate cause of the location of the Capital on the Potomac; but Mr. Bryan gives a meagre account of it. He has missed an important fact in relation to the change of votes by which the bargain was carried out, for he states that two members changed their votes—Alexander White and Richard Bland Lee of Virginia—whereas there were two others—Daniel Carroll and George Gale of Maryland. Carroll afterwards served as commissioner of the District and Mr. Bryan's account of him loses some force by the omission of the important part he played in locating the District.

The book opens with a discussion of the genesis of the idea that there must be a national capital; then follow the offers of various sites to the Continental Congress and the selection of the Potomac River region. There is a good description of the region, the early Indian inhabitants and the early white settlers. In chapter V. Mr. Bryan tells of the first church established in the District—that at Rock Creek in 1712—of the earliest school in 1785, of the first newspaper in 1789, of the early importance of Georgetown and the belief that it was destined to become one of the great ports of the country. Washington's itinerary in his investigation of the region in which Congress said the District must lie is told with interesting detail.

His selection met with general approval. He succeeded in including a Maryland and a Virginia city in the new district and he provided, as he thought, for a great commercial centre. The intricate proceedings which attended the establishment of the city are unravelled with detail and thoroughness. Mr. Bryan goes over the story of L'Enfant and Ellicott with impartiality and justice. L'Enfant's splendid plans were accepted; but L'Enfant was so constituted that he could not work in harmony with the commissioners and to lay out the city presented

practical questions of immediate importance which he would not attend to, so his separation from the enterprise became a necessity. Mr. Bryan says: "It is quite apparent, however, that he was determined on his own way, and mingled with the persistency of an egoist, was the serious lack of system and steadiness in continued effort. He was probably incapable by nature of following with constancy a given course and was beset and led astray by the largeness and variety of his conceptions as well as his firm conviction of the superiority of his ideas." There is an account of the various sales of lots and the discouraging efforts of the commissioners to raise money with which to build the city without an appropriation from the general government. In 1792 Samuel Blodgett, jr., appeared on the scene, the first of a long line of "promoters", who caused the early history of the development of the city to be inextricably interwoven with the efforts at personal aggrandizement of speculators. Blodgett was appointed "Supervisor of the buildings" and in general of the affairs of the District in 1794, and used his official position with a view to improving his personal fortune; but he did not succeed; in fact the early speculators nearly all failed, and the city was the grave of their hopes of fortune.

The government moved to the new city in 1800 and then began the problem of its government. Robert Brent was appointed mayor in 1802 and held the office until it was made elective in 1812. Mr. Bryan traces the rise of the local institutions chiefly in the last three chapters.

This is the best of the histories of Washington; in fact, it is the only one which deserves to be classed as a permanent contribution to the history of the city.

GAILLARD HUNT.

MINOR NOTICES

Master-Clues in World-History. By Andrew Reid Cowan. (London and New York, Longmans, 1914, pp. vii, 331.) This is an essay in "historical dynamics", which attempts to discover the "master clues", in the sense of the fundamental factors, which shaped the evolution of society. It is anthropology, geography, anthropo-geography, sociology, rather than "world history" in the ordinary sense of the political history of the various countries of the world. It deals (except for the last two chapters) with prehistoric man and the influence of his environment upon him. After distinguishing man from the animals by his capacity to use tools, he proceeds to the effects of climate, to the beginnings of agriculture, and of pastoral life. "Predatoriness" he finds a master clue. Nomadism is another, and its passing marked the beginnings of real civilization. The influence of the sea was progressive; the subjection of women a hindrance to the development of the race; slavery was the product of a sedentary civilization. History as recorded he thinks shows "drift" rather than purpose. The "tillage civilizations"

(the historic nations) have spent much time in aggression but differ from the less developed because they have always promptly repaired the waste.

The author is not a professional historian, but had already attained mature years before deciding to devote his leisure to study. His book is the result of wide reading by an acute mind. He was unfortunate, however, in selecting a subject which life-long study has not enabled even brilliant specialists to treat without exposing themselves to just and sometimes severe criticism. Much of his material is significant but not new; many of his profuse illustrations are curious and interesting but not very apposite. He is not sufficiently familiar with evidential problems or skilled in historical narration to subordinate the unessential and so to place in relief his master clues as to give the reader a coherent and unified impression of what he believes the course of development of society to have been.

R. G. USEER.

The Irshād Al-Arīb ilā Ma'rifat Al-Adīb or Dictionary of Learned Men of Yāqūt. Edited by D. S. Margoliouth, D.Litt., Laudian Professor of Arabic in the University of Oxford, and printed for the Trustees of the "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial". In six volumes. (Leyden, E. J. Brill, London, Luzac and Company, 1907-1913, pp. xvi, 431; xiii, 438; xv, 219; xii, 520; xii, 531.) It is now nearly fifty years since the first volume of Wustenfeld's six-volume edition of Yāqūt's great Geographical Dictionary appeared. Scholars will be glad that at last, through the liberality of the Gibb Trustees, Professor Margoliouth has been able to carry out the work which he tells us he designed undertaking many years ago and has made accessible in a printed edition part of the same author's *Dictionary of Learned Men*. Unfortunately he could give an edition of only a part of this great work, for, as he informs us, diligent inquiry has failed to reveal the existence of a manuscript of the whole work. In fact manuscripts of any part of it are very rare, so that volumes I., II., and III. I of this edition are based on a single manuscript in the Bodleian Library (MS. Bodl. Or. 753). At the time the preface of volume III. I was published this was the only known manuscript of the first of the four volumes into which the work seems to have been originally divided, so that for correcting the text the editor was obliged to have recourse to manuscripts and printed editions of authors whom Yāqūt had copied or who had copied Yāqūt. The preface to volume V. informs us that since the preface to volume III. I was published, "a manuscript containing some of the matter already published, but far older than the Bodleian manuscript, has through the kindness of Professor Yahuda come into the possession of the Bodleian Library". It is to be presumed that at least some of the results of a comparison of this manuscript with MS. Bodl. Or. 753 will be published in the concluding volume of this edition.

Volumes V. and VI. (nos. III. 2 and IV. being reserved on the chance of recovering more of the work), which seem to cover volume III. of the original work, are based on two manuscripts, one in Constantinople, the other formerly in Bombay, but now the property of Professor Margoliouth and Mr. Amedroz. It is on the latter manuscript that the larger part of volume VI. is based.

The editor informs us that the Gibb Trustees have agreed to publish an index to the five parts of the work already issued. This index will be preceded by a biography and by a collection of emendations proposed by various scholars. A final estimate of this edition may well be reserved till the appearance of this volume, but meantime both Professor Margoliouth and the Gibb Trustees are to be congratulated on the publication of the handsome volumes of this important work.

An Introduction to the History of the Church of England from the Earliest Times to the Present Day. By Henry Olfrey Wakeman, M.A. Eighth edition, revised with an additional chapter by S. L. Ollard, M.A. (London, Rivington, 1914, pp. 22, 519). The author of this deservedly popular and successful outline died in 1899 while preparing the sixth edition which was completed from his notes and duly published, three years after the first edition appeared.

In this eighth edition by Canon Ollard, the work has been corrected in several places, and revised by the addition of foot-notes, bringing it into harmony with the latest investigations. A concluding chapter has been added by the editor, covering the past seventeen years. An index and a chronological table are given, but no maps are inserted. The book is written in a graceful, interesting style, and gives a scholarly presentation of English Church history from the high Anglican standpoint, but with sympathetic appreciation of the Evangelical, if not of the Broad Church movement.

The author fails, as most of the writers on the subject fail, to understand the true place and development of the papacy in the English Church. A paragraph on page 220 illustrates this—"There never was in any true sense a papal church in England, but for nine hundred years there had been planted in England the Catholic Church of Christ, over which during the last four hundred years the popes had gradually acquired certain administrative rights which were now (1534) abolished." This is historically incorrect and misleading. The Catholic Church planted in England and flourishing there for nine hundred years was the papal church. The pope was acknowledged as fully and freely in England from the time of Augustine as he was anywhere else, indeed with less opposition; and the administrative rights acquired in England, in the four hundred years after the conquest, were the same acquired during that time throughout the whole Catholic Church in the West. The *English Church* was started by Augustine and traced its continuity through the unbroken succession of archbishops of Canterbury from Augustine on,

every one of whom received the pallium from the pope. A sentence at the foot of page 29 indicates a more correct view—"In Kent and Wessex, the Church was Roman and Papal, and had at its back the traditions of Western Christendom, the culture and prestige of Rome, the authority—vague and undefined, but constantly growing—of the See of Peter." The conversion of other parts of England from other sources does not affect this fact, for this was the beginning of the English Church, while the Council of Whitby and the archbishopric of Theodore established its continuous unity with the See of Rome as an integral part of the whole papal church of the West.

The supplementary chapter gives a valuable compendium of recent events and phases of church life in England, but of course the time is not yet when a true historical perspective can be given. In regard to one phase it is interesting to note that the recent attempt to introduce the Benedictine order, both for men and for women, proved unsuccessful and the larger part of the two communities seceded to Rome in 1913. Other large communities, however, have been established.

CHARLES L. WELLS.

Siegelkunde. Von Wilhelm Ewald. *Wappenkunde.* Von Felix Hauptmann. [Handbuch der Mittelalterlichen und Neueren Geschichte, herausgegeben von G. von Below und F. Meinecke, Professoren an der Universität Freiburg i. B.] (Munich and Berlin, R. Oldenbourg, 1914, pp. xiv, 244, 40 plates, viii, 61, 4 plates.) Of the two manuals which here appear in this excellent series, that of Ewald offers a convenient summary of the subject of sigillography. Fuller than the valuable outline of the subject by Ilgen in Meister's *Grundriss*, it is broader in scope than the recent French manual of Roman, which the author has evidently not seen. Although Ewald's own studies have been specially devoted to the seals of the Rhineland, he has worked his way through the extensive literature of sphragistics, including the local investigations which have been especially numerous in France, and treats the subject comparatively for the whole of Europe. After the fashion of the German manuals, he is fuller on the methods of preparing and applying seals and on their relations to chancery practices than on their external appearance and their interest for the history of costume and portraiture. One of the best features of the manual is the admirable series of forty plates which bring together a body of illustrations, many of them from fresh originals, such as has hitherto been available only in scattered and for the most part costly works. Here and there some of the author's statements need correction, as when he says (p. 157) that in the earlier period no regular distinction was made in the employment of different colors of wax. This is not true of the Sicilian kingdom of the twelfth century, where the royal seals were red, while those of the king's officers were green (*English Historical Review*, XXVI. 446).

Hauptmann's treatise is much briefer, giving only an outline of the

subject and referring for all developments to the fuller manual which he has in preparation. The material is for the most part limited to Germany, and the references are almost exclusively to German manuals, so that the student of the heraldry of other countries will gain little by mastering the technical German vocabulary. Even within the narrow limits set him, however, the author has indicated new conclusions which he hopes to justify in the larger volume. It is to be hoped that he will there consider critically the evidence which has been brought forward for the use of coats of arms in England and Normandy somewhat before the year 1150 from which he dates their introduction.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

A Short History of Feudalism in Scotland, with a Criticism of the Law of Casualties and a Chapter on the Ancient and Later Constitutions of Independent Scotland. By Hugh B. King, Solicitor. (Edinburgh and Glasgow, William Hodge and Company, 1914, pp. xxvii, 242.) This is an ill-ordered and tedious attack upon a recent decision of the House of Lords affecting the "casualty of composition" incident to the tenure of certain lands in Scotland. In the course of his treatment the author professes to explain the historical basis of this incident or casualty. He finds it in "the overgrown, illegitimate Scots feudalism" introduced from without and fostered by "visionary feudalists, great and small, ancient and modern, and their copyists", obscurantists biassed "in favour of the despotic foreign systems which they exclusively studied". These "feudal usurpations", once established, were enacted into pretended statutes by the "rampant marauders", who composed the "mere illegitimate coalition of feudal chiefs" which went by the name of the Scots Parliament in the seventeenth century. Thus this "feudal customary unlaw" was first introduced in the "illegitimate period of Scots feudal law" after the death of Robert Bruce, in imitation of the "despotic foreign system" which the "alien Norman Conquest" had brought into England; and it then gradually replaced the "beneficent legitimate Scots feudal system" which had existed in "the early legitimate period" under the "ancient Scot-Saxon constitution". Such assertions occur throughout the book with wearisome iteration but with little attempt at proof or even at explanation. The author's evident ignorance of Continental feudalism may probably be explained by his statement that "to deem such despotic foreign law to be legitimate Scots feudal law would tend to reduce a free people, with their worthy earlier traditions and beneficent laws and customs to the level of the conquered and decadent races of the Continent in barbarous times". Such ignorance, however, does not increase our confidence in the historical soundness of a book which professes to be, even though it is not, a "History of Feudalism in Scotland".

C. H. McILWAIN.

Henry VII. By Gladys Temperley, Fellow of Newnham College, Cambridge. With an Introduction by James T. Shotwell. [Kings and Queens of England, edited by Robert S. Rait and William Page.] (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914, pp. xiv, 453.) To the reader who has only a slight knowledge of the reign of Henry VII. this biography offers the most pleasant avenue of approach. It is more readable than Busch's and it has the advantage over Gairdner's of giving references to authorities and of being more comprehensive. The author appears to have made an independent study of the sources and her statement of fact seems to be in the main trustworthy. The book is not entirely free from misprints (*e. g.*, pp. 9, 83, 262) or from small errors of detail. "Italy", for example, could scarcely have been the ally of Henry VII. (p. 141) and Rymer certainly cannot be cited as authority for the assertion that Henry "on 14th July 1488 accepted his ambassador's action in renewing the treaty with France until January 1491-2" (pp. 76, 77). Such slips are not of sufficient frequency, however, to mar seriously an interesting narrative.

To the student who is already familiar with the works of Busch and Gairdner this book is likely to be a disappointment. The author who follows such writers may reasonably be expected to advance our knowledge a considerable distance. This Mrs. Temperley fails to do. She has brought to light little from sources not explored by these earlier biographers and her acquaintance with foreign literature seems to be much more limited than theirs. The work of Schanz, for example, is not mentioned in the rather carelessly constructed bibliography and it does not appear in the foot-notes except as quoted by Busch, although two chapters are devoted largely to economic and social aspects of the reign. In her chapters entitled *Settlement in the Kingdom, 1485-1487*, and *Last Years, 1503-1509*, there are a number of new facts, the appendixes contain a useful itinerary of the king, and the work as a whole renders Henry's personality a bit more definite. The reviewer has discovered no further contributions, except of comparatively unimportant details. Since large bodies of contemporary manuscripts still guard their store of information, the definitive biography of Henry remains unwritten.

W. E. LUNT.

The Age of Erasmus. Lectures delivered in the Universities of Oxford and London. By P. S. Allen, M.A., Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1914, pp. 303.) The reader must not suppose this book to contain a systematic series of lectures on the age of Erasmus. "Aspects of the Age of Erasmus" would have been a more exact title. With the exception of the paper on Erasmus and the Bohemian Brethren, read at the last International Congress of Historical Studies, a paper which comes nearer than the rest to full treatment of its subject, the lectures are such talks, well written but a little casual, as a man steeped in learning respecting Erasmus and his period might write

out, on occasion, for a cultivated audience. Schools (mostly Johann Butzbach's experiences), Monasteries (mostly Nicholas Ellenbog), Universities (mostly Erasmus), and Pilgrimages (mostly Felix Fabri), are four of the themes most entertainingly treated, while on private life and manners, on public force and fraud, and on the differences that make the Renaissance point of view and that of Erasmus so unlike our own, many interesting things are said, urbanely and without pedantry, but also without pretension to completeness. In a word, we have here, not a treatise, but a delightful book.

Registres du Conseil de Genève. Publiés par la Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de Genève. Tome V., *Du 7 février 1492 au 4 février 1499* (volumes 13 et 14). (Geneva, Kündig, 1914, pp. vii, 621.) The life of one of the four syndics who formed the core of the Genevan *consilium ordinarium* was not an altogether happy one. It is not surprising to find one syndic-elect offering to pay any fine rather than serve. A member of the council attended regularly two and often three sessions weekly besides several meetings annually of the general assembly of all citizens. In 1493 there were 124 meetings of the ordinary council and five of the general assembly. About six items on an average were treated at each meeting; the burden however lay in the following up of these items, the insistence upon prosecution of offenses, visitation of houses, streets, bridges, markets, investigation of complaints, devising means of raising money, maintenance of schools, resistance to encroachments upon the city's liberties, and keeping the balance between prince-bishop and his *vicedominus* and episcopal council, dukes of Savoy, and the commune itself. The complication was the greater because of the kinship and youth of dukes of Savoy and bishops of Geneva, a pair of five-year old cousins in 1495-1496. Naturally the city found little protection from its five-year old prince-bishop against his own father when the latter became duke.

By great firmness and shrewdness, timely gifts to influential courtiers, and appeal to Geneva's *iura* and written *franchises* solemnly sworn to by bishop and *vicedominus*, the sturdy representatives of the citizens usually proved successful. They appear to have secured the return of the bishop's court to Geneva, preserved a coveted market, and prohibited river obstructions (*fichiae*, in one case at least fish weirs). The records however leave the council still struggling against the bishop's demand for the tongues of all animals slaughtered. It required both independence and tact to protest successfully to those very ecclesiastics whose advice and aid they frequently had to seek in resisting the duke's illegal arrests and demands for subsidies.

There are the usual instances of police and sumptuary regulations: prohibitions of wandering about the streets after nine o'clock; disarming of foreigners and requirement of swords in citizens' houses; measures to protect against fire, the pest, loose women, mendicants, wandering

pigs and geese; regulation of prices of wine and meat (mutton and pork being priced about twice as high as beef); and an unrepeatd and probably fruitless attempt to "attend to the dress of women". Of particular interest are the prohibition in 1494 of sales, work, or games (*in publico*) on Sundays or feast days and, especially, the opening of *apothecae* on Sundays; examples in 1493-1494 of care to maintain neutrality between France and Germany; and several entries which disprove the statement of the celebrated eighteenth-century historian Gautier, who had no access to this volume and who held that there was no mention in this period of the council of fifty.

The admirable 114-page index suggests many topics for investigation, and gives useful French equivalents for obscure Latin terms. Scholars will be indebted to the skilled and accurate editors MM. Gautier, Van Berchem, and Rivoire, the Genevan Historical Society, and individuals who have given the series financial support. The subsidy of the Genevan *Conseil d'État* is amply justified and should be continued. The editors deserve every encouragement in their purpose to go on with the publication of the sixteenth-century records.

HERBERT DARLING FOSTER.

Biographical Register of Christ's College, 1505-1905, and of the Earlier Foundation, God's House, 1448-1505. In two volumes. Compiled by John Peile, Litt.D., F.B.A., Master of the College. (Cambridge, University Press, 1910, pp. viii, 620; vi, 954.) Hardly anything but affection toward an ancient college could persuade so accomplished a scholar as the late Dr. Peile to carry out the enormous labors of detail involved in such a work as this. Taking for his model Dr. Venn's *Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College*, he undertook to give in compact form the discoverable facts respecting the biography of every member of his venerable society from the foundation of God's House in 1448 to the year 1870. At the request of the college Mr. J. A. Venn has continued the record through the admissions of 1905, besides seeing Dr. Peile's manuscript through the press and preparing the index. The result of these labors of love is a collection of some ten thousand brief biographies. They abound in facts and dates rather than in characterizations; but a collection of even very compressed biographies of any ten thousand educated Englishmen makes a substantial contribution to English history. The great names are such as Grindall and Mildmay, Milton and Holles, Cudworth and Henry More, Paley and Darwin. But the American scholar will turn with equal interest to a series of names eminent in the early ecclesiastical history of New England and of Puritanism—Francis Johnson and John Smythe, William Perkins and William Ames, Ezekiel Rogers and Ralph Smith and John Allen of Dedham. Respecting some of these there are new facts.

The History of England from the Accession of James the Second. By Lord Macaulay. Edited by Charles Harding Firth, Regius Professor of Modern History, University of Oxford. Volume III. (London and New York, Macmillan, 1914, pp. xix, 1041-1532.) The third volume of Lord Macaulay's *History* as now published in its new and stately form fully bears out the promise of its two predecessors. More than a hundred and fifty illustrations, seven full-page plates in color, amply illustrate the narrative. Naturally as the story progresses the character of its illustrations tends to change. Most of the principal actors in the drama have been pictured; few of them had by 1689 left the stage; no great number of new figures had made their way to leading parts; and, in consequence, the portraits, while still numerous, begin to yield to other forms of illustration. Following the precedent set in the earlier volumes there appears a long array of documents, manuscripts, broadsides, and fugitive publications. The large number of reproductions of contemporary engravings is supplemented by photographs of still-standing memorials of the period, in particular the walls and guns which defended Londonderry in its famous siege. Of the colored plates—William, Mary, Dartmouth, Dorset, Burnet, Tyrconnell, and the Countess of Grammont—it is enough to say that though they do not yield in historic interest to some of their predecessors they are, with one or two exceptions, rather less decorative, and it is still too early to pass on the question of their selection. As to the text, beginning as it does with the rejoicings over the acquittal of the bishops which introduce chapter IX. and ending with the battle of Newtown Butler which concludes chapter XII., so covering the crisis of the Revolution, a word of quotation may prove interesting. In the possession of the reviewer, and so far as he is aware as yet unpublished, is an autograph letter of Macaulay's touching a part of this particular volume. "I hope", he writes December 3, 1853, "that early in 1855, I shall be able to publish two more volumes. I have little hope of being able to tell the story of the Irish wars in such a manner as to satisfy the bigots of any party. But I do not think that I shall be accused by any candid man of injustice towards the defenders of Londonderry." As one reads again the stirring passages with which this volume concludes, illuminated as they are by the illustrations which accompany them, the prophecy which inevitably comes to mind seems more than fulfilled.

WILBUR C. ABBOTT.

Figures du Passé: Dumouriez. Par Arthur Chuquet, Membre de l'Institut. (Paris, Hachette et Cie., 1914, pp. 287.) M. Chuquet's sketch of Dumouriez does not alter in its essential features a portrait with which the world has long been familiar. The hero of Valmy and Jemappes still seems to have possessed more ability than character and balance. In such a case it is important to fix the proportion between the qualities and the defects. M. Chuquet inclines to emphasize the

qualities. He believes that they were so brilliant as to justify the unmeasured ambition which Dumouriez appears to have cherished. The chief fault of Dumouriez in the author's estimation was "l'étourderie", which was the fault of his century. This blinded him to the difficulties of an enterprise, permitting him to see only its promise. Perhaps the impression that he was primarily an adventurer is due to the fact that the first two affairs in which he was engaged were the expedition to Corsica in 1768 and the mission to Poland two years later after the collapse of the Confederation of Bar.

M. Chuquet disposes rather summarily of the earlier part of the career of Dumouriez, devoting the greater part of the volume to his ministry, to the campaign in the Argonne, and to his attempt to overthrow the Convention. M. Chuquet brings out the fact, not sufficiently noticed hitherto, that Dumouriez was virtually minister of war while he was managing the foreign office. "Grave lui obéissait, comme un fils". From the first he planned to create a diversion by attacking the Austrian Netherlands. He did not believe that the new French army could successfully carry out defensive operations. It was, therefore, with great reluctance that in the summer, when he took Lafayette's place at the front, he consented to defer this project and to undertake to defend the road to Paris against the advancing Prussians. M. Chuquet makes very clear the real achievement of Dumouriez after Valmy. General Kellermann thought that the army should fall back behind the Marne and take up a strong defensive position. Servan, the minister of war, urged the same plan. This would have abandoned to the Prussians towns in which they might have easily established winter quarters. Dumouriez, however, refused to retreat, threatening the Prussian lines until Frederick William and Brunswick concluded to withdraw. It is unfortunate that M. Chuquet has not accompanied his description of these operations with maps. The reader unprovided with detailed military charts will be at a loss to locate many of the positions which are mentioned.

The later chapters of the book contain much new information about the writings of Dumouriez during his thirty years of exile. He was an unwearied apologist for his own career, and could never discover exactly why he had forfeited his claim to being a patriotic Frenchman.

H. E. B.

The Judicial Veto. By Horace A. Davis. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914, pp. vi, 148.) This volume contains three essays: the first discusses in an illuminating way the light-hearted readiness of courts to declare laws void; the second proposes a remedy for the existing practice, by proposing that in a formal review of the law the state be represented and that notice be given to the legislature which passed the law and to the public; the third, which was originally published in the *American Political Science Review*, purports to examine

the origin of the power of the United States Supreme Court to declare a law unconstitutional. A large portion of the volume is taken up with this third essay, which does not, however, really examine critically the origin of the power in question but is largely devoted to an attempt to show that the men in the ratifying state conventions did not on the whole intend to recognize or establish such power in the court.

It is difficult if not impossible to criticize justly the argument and method of the author in a brief notice; but it may not be unfair to say, first, that the power to declare laws void does not belong exclusively or peculiarly to the Federal Supreme Court, as a special tribunal set aside and aloft as a guardian of the Constitution. If one is interested in seeing the origin of judicial review, he is sure to be led astray by fixing his eyes upon that tribunal. Secondly, the author's contention that the early amendments, and notably the Tenth Amendment, were intended to restrain the court from declaring a law void appears extremely fanciful, inasmuch as the purpose of this amendment was to prevent the assumption of undue power by the federal government and this power of the court is also directed to prevent such assumption of power. Thirdly, to maintain that the Judiciary Act was phrased in such a way as implicitly to deny the power to the Supreme Court is to assume a position which all the clever argument of the author is far from establishing. It should be remembered that the particularists did not object to the power of the federal court to declare federal laws void—the more of such declarations the merrier—but to the possible absorption of general judicial authority, especially by the “inferior courts”, at the expense of the state courts and, perhaps, to the federal power of reviewing state legislation.

A. C. McL.

The Wars between England and America. By Theodore Clarke Smith, Professor of American History, Williams College. [The Home University Library of Modern Knowledge, no. 82.] (New York, Henry Holt and Company, London, Williams and Norgate, 1914, pp. viii, 256.) The title of this book is somewhat misleading. Those expecting to find much military history in it will be disappointed. It is virtually a résumé of American history from 1763 to the ratification of the treaty of Ghent in 1815, thus serving as a link between Andrews's *Colonial Period* and MacDonald's *From Jefferson to Lincoln* in the same series. The author has aimed primarily “to show how social, economic, and political causes led to a period of almost continuous antagonism between England and the American communities” during the interval. The Revolution and the War of 1812 give their names to the book “because they mark, in each case, the outcome of successive years of unavailing efforts on the part of each country to avoid bloodshed”.

Professor Smith has carried out his main purpose admirably. The various elements of antagonism between England and America which led to two wars within the space of half a century have been described

clearly and concisely. If at times the narrative appears too condensed, the limitations of space must plead excuse. To relate within the compass of 250 pages the story of such an eventful epoch in American history as that from 1763 to 1815 with a proper distribution of emphasis and in a manner that will appeal not only to the specialist but to the general reader is no mean achievement, and the author deserves high praise for performing it so successfully.

Most striking are the chapters relative to the Revolution. The treatment is refreshingly unconventional. The able soldiery displayed by many of the British generals, the manifold difficulties under which they labored in conducting a war at a distance of three thousand miles from their base, the superior fighting qualities repeatedly shown by the British troops, receive an unaccustomed recognition. Mingled with it are many unpleasant truths regarding the character of the Continental forces. Unfortunately the account is not without blemishes. The characterization of Barrington as a man who "lacked force" will be disputed by those who have had occasion to study his manuscript papers as Secretary at War. The assertion that it was necessary to feed the British armies entirely from England deserves modification. While the bulk of the provisions came from the home country, there is ample evidence to show that very considerable quantities were obtained in the theatre of the war. Howe, and not Gage, entertained the idea of attacking Dorchester Heights in March, 1776.

To the brief but well-chosen bibliography Belcher's *First American Civil War* should be added.

EDWARD E. CURTIS.

The Political and Sectional Influence of the Public Lands (1828-1842). By Raynor G. Wellington, A.M., Assistant Professor of History, University of South Dakota. (Printed at the Riverside Press, 1914, pp. 131.) This monograph covers exhaustively the field described by its title, if this title be properly understood to be limited to political history. The importance of the relation of the congressional discussions over the public lands to those on the tariff, on finance, and on internal improvements of course has been duly appreciated before: but no writer has so minutely studied the complicated interactions, in their legislative history, of the pre-emption and graduation measures of Benton, the distribution scheme of Clay, and the proposal of Calhoun to cede to the Western states, upon conditions, the public lands within the limits of those states. The introduction connects the narrative with the earlier history of the public lands: two chapters treat of the tariff, the surplus, the independent treasury, the assumption of the debts of the states, and the public lands, with reference to the sectional character of votes in Congress and to the policies of public men and of the Whig and Democratic parties: two chapters deal particularly with the presidential election of 1840: and the conclusion suggests some of the bearings of this period upon that which

followed. Every important vote is analyzed from the geographical as well as from the party standpoint. In the cases of three typical measures—Benton's graduation bill of 1830, Bibb's resolutions, in 1832, for the reference to the Committee on Manufactures of Clay's resolutions of that year, and Berrien's amendment to Clay's distribution bill of 1841—the votes are plotted in map form. The bibliographical apparatus, the notes, and the index are adequate. The printing in general is well done: on page 41, however, what should be "unnecessary" appears as "necessary", to the confusion of the thought of a paragraph.

William Gray of Salem, Merchant: a Biographical Sketch. By Edward Gray. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914, pp. viii, 124.) The present work consists in an eighty-five-page biographical sketch of the sort that one finds in the better class of local historical society publications, liberally padded with some excellent illustrations and an appendix, and offered to the public in a limited edition at four dollars the copy. William Gray of Salem was the wealthiest shipowner and merchant in the United States in the first decade of the nineteenth century. He owned thirty-six vessels in 1809, and was worth three million dollars. Until 1808 he was a local leader of the Federalist party, but he supported Jefferson's embargo policy, was elected lieutenant-governor of Massachusetts on the Gerry ticket, and subscribed liberally to government loans during the year of 1812. For these unpardonable sins, he received the social ostracism that dominant New England Federalism knew well how to inflict. Timothy Pickering described Gray as a "man of unspotted character" in 1799, but in 1812 he called him "in private affairs a shuffler, in public affairs a contemptible trimmer" (pp. 25-26). No one can read Mr. Gray's sketch of his ancestor without concluding that Pickering's earlier judgment was the correct one.

Unfortunately all of William Gray's commercial papers have been destroyed, save one letter-book of the years 1809-1812. It is regrettable that Mr. Gray did not publish this *in extenso* instead of devoting his appendix to a list of his ancestor's vessels, and much of his text to personal and family detail. The few extracts that he has printed throw an interesting light on the range and variety of Massachusetts commerce during this troubled period. There are hundreds of such letter-books and thousands of bundles of commercial correspondence still preserved in the garrets of New England mercantile families. A concerted effort should be made by the principal historical societies of the New England states to collect, preserve, and in part publish this material, thus paving the way for a full and connected account of New England commerce in the early nineteenth century, corresponding to Mr. Weeden's work on the colonial period.

A History of Dartmouth College, 1815-1909. By John King Lord. Being the second volume of *A History of Dartmouth College and the Town of Hanover, New Hampshire*, begun by Frederick Chase. (Concord, N. H., the Rumford Press, 1913, pp. viii, 725.) When the decision of the Supreme Court in the Dartmouth College Case was announced, Francis Hopkinson wrote to President Brown, "I would have an inscription over the door of your building, 'Founded by Eleazar Wheelock, Refounded by Daniel Webster'". The words now appear at the entrance of Webster Hall, dedicated toward the close of President Tucker's administration. Mr. Chase's volume described the founding of the college by Eleazar Wheelock. Professor Lord's volume continues Dartmouth's history from the events which led to its "refounding" by Webster through the era of its rebuilding during the remarkably successful years of guidance under President Tucker. The author's training and qualifications for his task are obvious; a grandson of Dr. Nathan Lord, president from 1828 to 1863, an alumnus, a member of the faculty for many years, and twice acting president of the college, he knows its traditions, spirit, and newer aspirations. The expectations raised by the author's position are realized by the performance. Professor Lord has written a volume worthy of the college and an important chapter in the history of American education. Not less important is his contribution to the history of the Dartmouth College Case. Shirley's *Dartmouth College Causes* (a book long out of print and deserving of a new edition) was the result of painstaking investigations into the political and personal, as well as the constitutional, aspects of that great dispute. Professor Lord, whose position is naturally favorable to the college and hence opposed to Shirley's, goes fully into the beginnings of the matter and we are let into a somewhat petty contention over the control of the Hanover church, which split the community and the college. The Dartmouth College controversy was at first personal and theological (just which element preceded it is difficult to determine); it became political and ended as an important landmark in constitutional development. Depending upon the point of view it has been regarded as a contest between Presbyterianism and Congregationalism, between conservatism and liberalism in theology, between aristocratic federalism and democracy, even between narrow-minded collegiate administration and academic freedom. All of these elements have much interest, but naturally fade before the constitutional importance of Webster's successful effort. There is another side to the picture which Professor Lord's sympathies have naturally led him to neglect: one wonders, after reading the account of Dartmouth's struggles as a small college for so many years after Webster had "refounded" it, what position in the history of American education Dartmouth might have taken had the state of New Hampshire been victorious. "Dartmouth University" under the control of New Hampshire as early as 1820 might have rendered to state and nation services different of course but possibly even greater than those which Dartmouth College

has actually performed, great as those have been. And the state would have vindicated a principle which Maitland has shown to be a vital one, the keeping of the corporation under the state's lock and key. One may note, too, that the relations between the state and the college form a problem not yet solved.

Lack of space forbids consideration of other topics of interest: the Northern Academy of Arts and Sciences, the surprising pro-slavery sentiments of President Lord and their effect upon the college, the growth of alumni control in the face of the rigid provisions of the Wheelock charter as to the selection of trustees (provisions which have come to be almost a legal fiction), and the marvellous development under President Tucker. All have an appeal beyond the limits of an alumni circle. Dartmouth has her own history and in the two volumes by Chase and Lord we have that history well told.

JESSE S. REEVES.

Massachusetts Historical Society, Proceedings, October, 1913-June, 1914. Volume XLVII. (Boston, the society, 1914, pp. xvi, 555.) Most of the matter which makes up this interesting volume has already been commented on, as it appeared serially from month to month, in the section of this journal devoted to historical news. It is noteworthy, to how large an extent the volumes of the society's proceedings are coming to consist of material relating to the nineteenth century, which until some five years ago had little place in the society's publications. Thus, the most noteworthy papers in the present volume are that of Mr. Edward Stanwood, on the history of reciprocity of trade with Canada, and that of Mr. Charles Francis Adams, entitled "A Crisis in Downing Street", in which he rewrites the history of English cabinet consultations and diplomacy respecting America in the autumn of 1862; while the three leading groups of documentary material in the volume are, a body of letters addressed to Jonathan Russell between 1801 and 1822, the letters of Elbridge Gerry in 1813 and 1814, and those of the Duke and Duchess of Argyll to Charles Sumner, 1861 to 1865. Mr. Curtis Guild's miscellaneous but interesting set of letters of the presidents belongs to the same period. Yet earlier centuries are not neglected, as witness the curious paper on witchcraft by Cotton Mather with critical annotations by Robert Calef which Mr. Worthington Ford has lately discovered; a group of papers from the British Museum exhibiting the relations between John Wilkes and Boston; and Professor Channing's paper on Washington and parties, 1789-1797.

Nantucket: a History. By R. A. Douglas-Lithgow, M.D., LL.D. (New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914, pp. xiii, 389.) This is the first comprehensive account of this well-known island since Obed Macy's *History of Nantucket*, first published in 1835. The author states in his foreword that a new history of a "popular character" has been

a general desire for some time past, and this is certainly just such a book. There are twenty chapters, covering a variety of topics. The first five treat of the geology and physiography of the island, its legends, the aborigines, early white settlers, and development. Chapters IX. and X. are on the nineteenth century and contain a heterogeneous mass of facts—not a continuous historical narrative, as the author himself admits. The remaining chapters are essays on subjects which have little connection with each other, several of them by other writers. The more important are those on the whale fishery, Quakerism, Nantucket records, eminent Nantucketers, life-saving service and wrecks, newspapers, flora, etc. The chief characteristic of the volume is the enormous amount of detail respecting families, houses, place-names, and facts of every conceivable kind, important and trivial. Much of this material is arranged in chronological order and gives one the impression that he is reading a diary or the local column of a country newspaper, rather than a history. Nevertheless some of the chapters are valuable, especially those on the early development of the island, Quakerism, and Nantucket records, and that on newspapers by Harry B. Turner. The chapter on Nantucket flora by Grace Brown Gardner is important and contains a fifteen-page list of the plants growing on the island. The volume is for the most part based on a large mass of first-hand material, though few citations are given. It is undoubtedly the best history of Nantucket yet written and must be read by all who wish to know the history, especially in the nineteenth century, of this unique community.

MARCUS W. JERNEGAN.

Simeon North, First Official Pistol Maker of the United States: a Memoir. By S. N. D. North, LL.D., and Ralph H. North. (Concord, N. H., the Rumford Press, 1913, pp. xii, 207.) Colonel Simeon North (1765–1851) was an ingenious, capable, and public-spirited manufacturer of fire-arms, and a man of sterling character, whose word was as good as his bond. Few materials for his life exist, except an imperfect series in Washington archives of his correspondence and contracts with the federal government. Chiefly on the basis furnished by these, two of his great-grandsons have compiled this memoir, partly in order to do honor to his memory, and partly to illustrate the history of an interesting branch of Connecticut manufactures. The title of the book refers to Simeon North's position as the first, and for many years the sole, civilian maker of pistols for the United States government; for pistols, almost as many as he made, were manufactured in the government armories at Springfield and Harper's Ferry from 1795 on. North's contracts began in 1799. That of 1813 is noteworthy as being the first United States contract for fire-arms with interchangeable parts, such standardization, not before this applied to other varieties of manufacture, being made possible by North's inventions of appropriate machinery. Excellent illustrations show some of the models of the 50,000 pistols he made for the govern-

ment between 1799 and 1828, and of the 18,000 muskets he made between that date and 1851, when he died. His fifty years of work under government contracts were conducted to the entire satisfaction of the government, and without the need of controversy. They were fifty years of quiet and conscientious labors, fruitful in improvements of which the government reaped the benefits. An unpretending sketch, the book is interesting and, within its limited sphere, of decided value.

Pennsylvania, the Keystone: a Short History. By Samuel Whitaker Pennypacker, Governor of the Commonwealth, 1903-1907. (Philadelphia, Christopher Sower Company, 1914, pp. 316.) A former governor, ex-judge, and president of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania has written a very interesting short outline history of the Keystone State. Considerable merit attaches to the book from the fact that the author was not content to build merely on the work of others, but extracted much of his knowledge from the raw material, some printed and some in manuscript, seldom used. Foot-notes are rigidly excluded, because, as the author quotes, they encumber the pages "like barnacles on the keel of a vessel and delay progress". References may be out of place for a short and popular history, but the application of this principle to historiography in general is not sound. The bibliography, organized along most unorthodox lines, contains fifty-odd titles of which more than one-half refer to original materials. The story is told in plain and simple language, bringing to view many essential historical facts, including many new and curious data, interwoven with considerable anecdote and romance. There is little attempt at interpretation or expression of opinion. For the most part the facts are classified according to chronology or topic. Sixteen chapters trace the history of the state in its varied career from the foundation of the colony to the present. Thirteen chapters give the history of the separate subjects, slavery, art, literature, science, law, education, religion, natural resources, industrial development, and transportation. Curiously enough, agriculture and the industry of the thrifty "Dutch" farmer of the great central valley were not selected for separate treatment. The book contains over a hundred well-chosen illustrations.

Relatively more attention is given to the Germans and Quakers than to the Scotch-Irish. Swedish and Dutch settlements on the Delaware are each honored with a chapter, the Scotch-Irish none. Why an element in the population of such size and strength of character and of such great force in the history of both the state and nation should not be properly recognized, we do not presume to state. The author wrote his book with a purpose; local pride and patriotism have led him to select only those facts which display the state in her best clothes. In this view of history, it must be admitted, something of truth and accuracy is lost. It is true a beautiful capitol was built without taxing or borrowing, but why no mention of the scandalous misuse of the state's money in

building? There is no quarrel with the contrast made between the hearty response of Pennsylvania and the recalcitrant attitude of Massachusetts during the War of 1812. We do think it unfair, however, to fail to point out either the offensive conduct of Pennsylvania during the French and Indian War or the great energy shown then by the Bay Colony. We are curious to know why Franklin, James Wilson, and Albert Gallatin are not included along with Buchanan, Quay, Cameron, in the list of those who by force of character and intelligence dominated the affairs of the state. To say that James Wilson perhaps more than any other affected the results reached in the memorable convention of 1787 is to ignore the work of the master-builder, James Madison.

W. T. ROOT.

A History of the General Property Tax in Illinois. By Robert Murray Haig, Ph.D. [University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, vol. III., nos. 1 and 2.] (Urbana, University of Illinois, 1914, pp. 235.) It is impossible in the course of a three or four hundred word review to do justice to a book of so many pages. The monograph of Mr. Haig is one of the many evidences of a larger interest in taxation stimulated by changing economic conditions. The states are coming to a realization of the absurdity of present methods, but an awakening of the people yet remains to be accomplished. Painsstaking presentation of facts in a simple, straightforward way will help to do this. This, I take it, has been Mr. Haig's purpose.

Under the divisions of the Pre-Territorial Origin, the Formative Period, the Debt Paying Period and the Present Day Period the author, in twelve chapters, presents the prosaic, sordid story of taxation in Illinois. His conclusions are practically the same as those of every investigator in the tax history of our states. The catalogue of them includes gross undervaluation, lack of uniformity, lack of universality or completeness of assessment, and defective administration. What more could be wanted for an absurd fiscal policy?

The steps which may be taken in dealing with the situation are modified, unfortunately, by political conditions based upon the old motto "We know where we are now; why make any change?" But even this view does not prevent codification and simplification of the code and it ought not to stand too long against the establishment of a tax commission. No tax commission can get very far without coming flat against the old general property provisions in the constitutions. Segregation of state and local revenues would relieve both the state and the communities from many embarrassing things. The great dragon in the way is the corporation standing out against any change in the general property tax when applied to them in contrast to the individual who moves about on two feet. All of these proposals Mr. Haig brings out clearly in his concluding chapter. The book, if it could be forced into the eyesight of

political leaders, ought to bring at least some prickings of conscience over the barren waste in the Illinois fiscal policy.

FRANK L. McVEY.

Semi-Centennial History of West Virginia. By James Morton Callahan, Professor of History and Political Science, West Virginia University. (Charleston, West Va., Semi-Centennial Commission of West Virginia, 1913, pp. ix, 594.) While the early settlement, the early industrial and social life, the historic highways, the first railroads, and the sectional contest between eastern and western Virginia are more attractively and scientifically presented than heretofore by any other author, the chief contributions of Professor Callahan's *Semi-Centennial History* are to be found in the chapters upon the period since the Civil War. It is in these and by the use of carefully selected data illustrated by numerous maps, that the story of the industrial and political awakening of West Virginia is told; that one sees those earlier pioneer ideals, determined largely by experiences under frontier conditions and by contact with the mother-state, break down, giving away to new enterprises, new problems, new hopes, and new ambitions, which collectively made impossible all subsequent attempts to reunite the Virginias and gave West Virginia an identity peculiarly her own. Conceived as they generally are in the minds of politicians and executed by their zealous but ill-informed henchmen, such patriotic productions as this one rarely contain much that is either accurate or worth while, but, fortunately for the much neglected field of which it treats and for those who will be influenced by its scientific methods, this volume is the work of a master. It should and doubtless will soon displace the older and less scientific histories of West Virginia.

An interesting feature of the book, one of great value to scholars and researchers, is its numerous and in some instances rare maps. Beginning with a map of the District of Augusta and following with one of the later mother-counties of 1790, practically every important phase of the industrial and political development of the state from that time to the present is illustrated either by drawings by the author or by reproductions of maps in the Library of Congress. Those covering the period since the formation of the state suggest many fruitful topics of research in its modern political and industrial development. The main historical narrative, consisting of over half the volume, is followed by an extensive bibliography, a comprehensive subject-index, and about thirty special articles upon such topics as education, transportation, mineral resources, taxation, horticulture, etc.

CHARLES H. AMBLER.

The Establishment of State Government in California, 1846-1850. By Cardinal Goodwin, M.A. (New York, the Macmillan Company, 1914, pp. xiv, 359.) Mr. Goodwin belongs to that group of younger

scholars who, under direction of Professor Herbert E. Bolton, have been making fresh researches in the Bancroft Collection, University of California. His contributions to *Overland Monthly* and the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* are forerunners of this book, which covers with painstaking detail the political aspects of California history during the eventful years 1846-1850. "The Interregnum", "The Constitutional Convention", and "The Organization of State Government", are the divisions treated in a total of nineteen chapters.

The book reflects the spirit of dispassionate investigation, the author making extensive use of the sources and showing acquaintance with a wide range of secondary writers. His method almost precludes the possibility of literary style and makes it difficult to preserve true perspective. Conscientious regard for technique is everywhere evidenced.

Perhaps the chief specific contribution is in adducing the evidence to show that, contrary to the commonly accepted view, the delegates in the Constitutional Convention who advocated the wide eastern boundary for California were not a group of southern men conspiring to form a state so vast that subsequent division by an east-and-west line into two states would prove necessary. The evidence goes to show it was not sectionalism but a "desire to obtain immediate admission to statehood" that prompted the delegates (p. 174).

Models for California were found in the constitutions of Iowa and New York, and the constitutions of "twenty individual states were cited during the proceedings of the Convention" (p. 237). Honorable John Currey, former chief justice of the supreme court of California, in a personal letter to the present reviewer, speaks of loaning a volume containing the constitutions of all thirty states to a delegate (probably Lippitt), and adds: "That it was used in the Convention I do not doubt".

A few typographical errors are noted: as in spelling *diputacion* (p. 9), Pedrorena (pp. 84, 128), and Botts' (p. 203); use of the wrong numeral for a second foot-note (p. 137); omission of volume-number in citation to Bancroft (p. 219), and to Hittell (p. 224). The index should be more complete. Thus one looks in vain for such important names as Halleck, Lippitt, Benton, Clay, President Taylor.

Mr. Goodwin is tempted at times to go too far afield, as in devoting generous space to the Panic of 1837 (pp. 175-177), and congressional land grants for educational purposes (pp. 198 ff.). The book would have been improved if the author had better succeeded in the difficult task of weaving all into more readable narrative. Nevertheless it will prove a welcome and valuable contribution towards the preparation of the worthy history of California—which has not yet been written.

ROCKWELL D. HUNT.

The Descendants of Jöran Kyn of New Sweden. By Gregory B. Keen, LL.D. (Philadelphia, the Swedish Colonial Society, 1913, pp. 318.) Jöran Kyn, commonly called Jöran Snöhuitt ("Snow-white"),

was a Swedish colonist who arrived in New Sweden with Governor Johan Printz in 1643 and became the chief proprietor of land at Upland, now Chester, Pennsylvania, but was not otherwise conspicuous. In volumes II.-VII. of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (1878-1883) Dr. Keen published a series of genealogical articles upon the descendants of this patriarch. These articles have long been recognized as of high merit, partly on the ordinary grounds of genealogical accuracy and fulness, but mainly because of the great amount of interesting biographical detail respecting not only the descendants of Jöran Kyn, but all manner of important persons in the colonies of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware who intermarried with such descendants or were related to them. These articles Dr. Keen, vice-president of the new Swedish Colonial Society, has now combined into a volume for that society. It supplies the largest amount of information accessible in print respecting any section of the Swedish population on the Delaware River after the times of Swedish rule. For instance, Jöran Kyn's descendants in the sixth generation (beyond which the compilation does not extend) numbered not less than 264, and no doubt at the present time his descendants may be counted by thousands, furnishing a striking example of the wide diffusion of blood of an early Swedish settler on the Delaware. Also many colonial worthies of English and other descent have their record in the book. The compiler states that many additions have been made to what was printed in the original articles in the *Pennsylvania Magazine*, and this seems to be the case; but he also says that no attempt has been made to introduce information derived from Dr. Amandus Johnson's *Swedish Settlements on the Delaware*, previously published by the same society, and this is a distinct defect, since that book contains many data which might profitably have been worked into this compilation.

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Association holds its annual meeting, with an attractive programme, in Chicago on December 29, 30, and 31. The usual article descriptive of the meeting will appear in our next number. The Executive Council, at its preliminary meeting of November 28, voted to recommend that the meeting of December, 1916, be held in Cincinnati; that of 1915 is by vote of the Association to be held in Washington. It was reported that war conditions compel for the present a suspension of activity in the preparation of the Bibliography of Modern English History.

The Pacific Coast Branch held its autumn meeting in San Francisco in the last days of November. The intercalary meeting which the American Historical Association is to hold on the Pacific Slope in 1915 has been fixed for the three days July 21 (San Francisco), 22 (Berkeley), 23 (Palo Alto), with an opening meeting on the evening of July 20. The programme is expected to be devoted specifically to the history of the Pacific Ocean and the various countries upon its shores.

The first volume of the *Annual Report* for 1913 is in galley-proof; the second volume, Papers of James A. Bayard, edited by Miss Elizabeth P. Donnan, is nearly ready for the press. The next report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission will contain the extant papers of R. M. T. Hunter, with perhaps other Virginian papers of his time.

The manuscript of the annual bibliography, *Writings on American History, 1913*, prepared by Miss Grace G. Griffin, has gone to the Yale University Press. In order that continuance of publication by that press may be ensured, members are earnestly reminded that a large increase of sales of the volume for 1912 is requisite.

In the *Original Narratives* series, publication of *Narratives of the Insurrections* has, by a mishap to the index, been deferred to the spring.

In the September number of the *History Teacher's Magazine*, Dr. R. V. D. Magoffin commences a series of articles on the Teaching of Roman History, with a chapter on the Archaeological History of Rome after 450 B. C.; Professor William F. Russell contributes an historical account of the Early Teaching of History in Secondary Schools, while the editor makes sagacious and timely observations on the European War and History Teachers. In the October issue are to be noted "Early Rome and Italy", by Professor G. W. Botsford, "A Single Aim in His-

tory Teaching", by Leroy F. Jackson, and a group of personal letters of Elihu B. Washburne, written in 1870-1871 while he was minister (not "ambassador") of the United States in Paris. The number for November is notable, apart from its leading article, Greek Civilization in the Roman Empire by Professor W. L. Westermann, for a paper by Mr. David Snedden, commissioner of Education in Massachusetts, on the Teaching of History in Secondary Schools, with a reply by Professor George L. Burr on "What History shall we Teach?" In the issue of December are articles by Professor P. Orman Ray on "Topics of State History fruitful for Research", by Professor L. B. Smith on the Place of History in a Technical School, and by Moses W. Ware, "A Side Light on the War of 1812".

PERSONAL

Rear-Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan, U. S. N. retired, died on December 1 at Washington, where he had in November begun a period of association with the Carnegie Institution of Washington. Born in 1840 at West Point, the son of a distinguished professor of engineering familiar with French systems of scientific education, he was early trained to that remarkable clearness and directness of thought and expression which always distinguished him. His naval career, from the time of his entrance into the Naval Academy in 1856, has been described by himself, modestly but with great interest and in its proper setting of American naval history, in a most enjoyable book of reminiscences entitled *From Sail to Steam* (1907). In this he has described how the reading of Napier, the writing of a book on *The Gulf and Inland Waters* in our Civil War, and the call to lecture on naval history at the Naval War College founded in 1885, turned him to the career of the historian. His first great work, *The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660-1783* (1890), may fairly be said to have achieved a greater influence upon the public mind of Europe and America than any other historical book of our generation. However largely the contemporary state of Europe may be responsible for such an effect, the book deserved its success when considered solely from the point of view of the historian, for the power of lucid thought, the penetration and insight, with which Captain Mahan extracted the meaning from history, are rare and impressive gifts, and his style, sinewy, direct, and simple, yet cultivated, was suited to the workings of a strong mind dealing with momentous themes. The same qualities, with fuller opportunities for research, marked *The Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire* (1892), *The Life of Nelson, the Embodiment of the Sea Power of Great Britain* (1897), and *Sea Power in its Relations to the War of 1812* (1905); but his first book had made his reputation secure. The fresh vista which it had opened into history could never be closed. In 1902 he was president of the American Historical Association. It was characteristic, that he chose as the theme of his presidential address Subordination in His-

torical Treatment, the necessity and method of such grouping and emphasis as should present in truthful proportions the central elements of the historian's thought. Admiral Mahan was a man of elevated and religious character, of profitable and delightful conversation, modest, courteous, and lovable.

Professor Reinhold Koser of Berlin died in that city on August 25, 1914, at the age of sixty-two years. He was general director of the Prussian State Archives, and had published numerous works relating to Brandenburg-Prussia and the Hohenzollerns, the most important being his *Geschichte Friedrichs des Grossen*.

Georges Perrot, perpetual secretary of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres, and joint author with the late Charles Chipiez of the well-known *Histoire de l'Art dans l'Antiquité*, died in the last days of June, at the age of eighty-one.

William Nelson, for more than thirty years corresponding secretary of the New Jersey Historical Society, died on August 10, at the age of sixty-seven. On the history of New Jersey there was no higher authority. Besides many other useful publications in that field, and in that of the history and bibliography of early American newspapers, he had edited nearly all the volumes of the *New Jersey Archives*.

Miss Margaret S. Morriss has been promoted to an assistant professorship in history at Mt. Holyoke College.

Dr. Annie Heloise Abel has been appointed to a full professorship of history in Goucher College.

Mr. Morgan P. Robinson has been elected archivist of the Virginia State Library, assuming the duties of that office on January 1, 1915.

Dr. Robert G. Caldwell has been appointed assistant professor of history at Rice Institute, Houston, Texas.

Professor David L. Patterson of the University of Kansas is supplying the place of Professor A. L. P. Dennis of the University of Wisconsin during the present academic year.

GENERAL

Professor F. K. Ginzel of the Prussian Institute for Astronomical Calculations has issued a third volume, concluding his *Handbuch der Mathematischen und Technischen Chronologie, das Zeitrechnungswesen der Völker* (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1914, pp. vii, 445), which contains a mass of information useful to the historian in solving the intricate and unusual problems of chronology.

Messrs. Putnam are shortly to publish a volume by Miss Ruth Putnam on *Alsace and Lorraine from Caesar to Kaiser*, 57 B. C.—1871 A. D., a study dealing with the political affiliations of the provinces throughout their history.

Art and Archaeology in its November number presents, in its series upon Masterpieces of Aboriginal American Art by Professor W. H. Holmes, an illustrated account of minor examples of mosaic work; and has also an illustrated account of the German excavations at Baalbek, by Professor L. B. Paton.

The October and November *Bulletins* of the New York Public Library continue its check-list of newspapers and official gazettes to the section for Virginia, and its list of works relating to Scotland through the economic and sociological sections. The library has also issued a *List of Works relating to the History and Condition of the Jews in various Countries* (pp. 278), extracted from a series of its *Bulletins*.

Numerous articles have appeared in recent months regarding the superstition about ritual murder by the Jews, and an exhaustive investigation of the subject can now be found in *Le Crime Rituel chez les Juifs* (Paris, Téqui, 1914, pp. 376) by A. Monnier.

The *Biblioteca Coloniale*, to be published by Signor Barbera, Florence, opens with the first volume of the *Storia del Commercio*, by Gino Luzatto. This volume begins with ancient times and comes down to the Renaissance. The work will be complete in two volumes.

War's Aftermath: a preliminary Study of the Eugenics of War as illustrated by the Civil War of the United States and the late Wars in the Balkans, by Dr. David Starr Jordan and Harvey E. Jordan, is more particularly a study, confessedly tentative and somewhat lacking in definite scientific results, of the effect of the Civil War upon the quality of manhood in the South (Houghton Mifflin Company).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. H. Hull, *The Service of Statistics to History* (Quarterly Publication of the American Statistical Association, March); A. Cavalli, *Il Fenomeno Associativo dai "Collegia" Antichi alle "Corporazioni" Medioevali*, I. (Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali e Discipline Ausiliarie, October); M. Vauthier, *La Doctrine du Contrat Social* (Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles, May).

ANCIENT HISTORY

Outlines of Ancient History from the Earliest Times to the Fall of the Roman Empire in the West, A. D. 476, by Harold Mattingly (Cambridge University Press, pp. 458) is a very compressed narrative, said to attain a high standard of accuracy.

The Macmillan Company are shortly to publish a "General Index" to Dr. J. G. Frazer's *The Golden Bough* series.

Messrs. Williams and Norgate announce a volume on the *Antiquity of Man*, by Professor Arthur Keith.

The Princeton University Press has brought out *Biblical Libraries: a Sketch of Library History from 3400 B. C. to A. D. 150*, by E. C. Richardson, librarian of Princeton University.

Dr. E. A. Wallis Budge has recently published two brief treatises, popular in character, and perhaps somewhat hasty in workmanship, yet representing much learning, *A History of the Egyptian People*, and *The Literature of the Egyptian People*.

An elaborate volume by D. Mallet is devoted to *Les Premiers Établissements des Grecs en Égypte, VII^e et VI^e Siècles* (Paris, Leroux, 1914).

Dr. D. G. Hogarth is the author of a recent addition to the *Home University Library, The Ancient East*, which covers the history of Western Asia between 1000 B. C. and the conquests of Alexander.

Mr. S. Langdon, in *Tammuz and Ishtar* (Oxford University Press, 1914, pp. 208) presents a monograph upon Babylonian religion and theology containing extensive extracts from the Tammuz liturgies and the whole of the Arbela oracles.

Important contributions to Greek history are made by A. Ledl, *Studien zur älteren Athenischen Verfassungsgeschichte* (Heidelberg, Winter, 1914); Paul Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Eleusis* (Paris, Picard, 1914); and E. Pokarny, *Studien zur Griechischen Geschichte im Sechsten und Fünften Jahrzehnt des Vierten Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Griefswald, 1914, pp. 167).

The *Loeb Classical Library* has added two new volumes recently, vol. II. of Suetonius, translated by Professor J. C. Rolfe, and the first volume of a two-volume edition of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* by Mr. Walter Miller.

L'Hellénisation du Monde Antique (Paris, Alcan, 1914) contains a series of illuminating lectures by V. Chapot, G. Colin, A. Croiset, J. Hatzfeld, A. Jardé, P. Jouguet, G. Leroux, A. Reinach, and T. Reinach delivered at the School of Higher Social Studies in Paris.

A. W. Pickard-Cambridge of Balliol College, Oxford, is the author of one of the latest additions to the *Heroes of the Nations* series, *Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom* (Putnam).

The July-September number of the *American Journal of Archaeology* contains, from the hands of Messrs. W. H. Buckler and David N. Robinson, the text, translation, and an elaborate description of and commentary upon a Greek inscription from Sardes, setting forth honors received by one Menogenes, 6-1 B. C., and casting light on municipal government in Sardes and on the union of cities of Asia under Augustus. This is followed by Professor Colburn's third article on Lanuvium.

There is now available a second, revised and enlarged edition of G. Dottin, *Manuel pour servir à l'Étude de l'Antiquité Celtique* (Paris,

Champion, 1914, pp. 500). Still another useful volume for the prehistoric period is Feldhaus, *Die Technik der Vorzeit, der Geschichtlichen Zeit, und der Naturvölker* (Leipzig, Engelmann, 1914).

Under the title *À travers le Monde Romain* (Paris, Fontemoing) Professor René Cagnat of the French Institute publishes lectures given by him at the Musée Guimet, dealing vividly with some aspects of Roman civilization.

A well-made book of distinctly popular character is *Republican Rome*, by H. L. Havell, the second of the *Great Nations* series, published by Stokes and Company.

Dr. W. Brewitz, *Scipio Africanus Maior in Spanien, 210-206* (Tübingen, Laupp, 1914, pp. viii, 86) is a doctoral dissertation. An elaborate folio volume, with various maps, on *Die Keltiberer und ihre Kriege mit Rom* (Munich, Bruckmann, 1914) is by A. Schulten.

Dr. W. Warde Fowler has followed his general work on the religious ideas of the Romans by a special study on *Roman Ideas of Deity in the Last Century before the Christian Era*, which consists of lectures delivered at Oxford (Macmillan).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. W. von Bissing, *Denkmäler zur Geschichte des Kunst Amenophis IV.* (Sitzungsberichte der K. Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl., 1914, 3); H. Vincent, *Gézer et l'Archéologie Palestinienne après six Ans de Fouilles*, I. (Revue Biblique, July); H. Treidler, *Die Skythen und ihre Nachbarvölker* (Archiv für Anthropologie, XLI. 3); S. Heinlein, *Der Wirtschaftliche Niedergang Ioniens und der Ionische Aufstand* (Ungarische Rundschau, July); F. M. T. Böhl, *Die Juden im Urteil der Griechischen und Römischen Schriftsteller* (Theologisch Tijdschrift, XLVIII. 5).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

General reviews: W. Bauer, *Neues Testament, Apostelgeschichte und Apostolisches Zeitalter* (Theologische Rundschau, June); E. Klostermann, *Kirchengeschichte, Altchristliche Litteratur*, II., *ibid.*

The twenty-seventh *Beiheft* of the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* contains a collection of *Studien zur Semitischen Philologie und Religionsgeschichte* dedicated to Professor Julius Wellhausen on his seventieth birthday, May 17, 1914. Among the twenty-one papers are: A. A. Bevan, "Mohammed's Ascension to Heaven"; K. Budde, "Zur Geschichte des Buches Amos"; C. F. Burney, "The Topography of Gideon's Rout of the Midianites"; P. Haupt, "Die Schlacht von Taanach"; J. Meinhold, "Zur Frage der Kultuszentralisation"; R. W. Rogers, "Sennacherib and Judah", and A. Rahlfs, "Verzeichnis der Schriften Julius Wellhausens".

The Bampton Lectures for 1913, *The Church in Rome in the First Century*, by Rev. George Edmundson (Longmans), adhere to the tradi-

tion of St. Peter's visit to Rome in 42 and trace with much detail his subsequent movements.

Two more fascicles have been added to Cuthbert H. Turner's *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* (Oxford University Press), the first containing documents relating to the Council of Nicaea, the second the acts of the councils of Gangra and Antioch.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. Erbes, *Die Zeit des Mura-torischen Fragments* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XXXV. 3); P. Corssen, *Das Martyrium des Bischofs Cyprian*, I. (Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XV. 3); W. Soltau, *Das Pontifikale Jahrbuch und seine Rekonstruktion* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXV. 3); C. Guignebert, *Le Dogme de la Trinité*, I-IV. (Scientia, XXXII., XXXIII., XXXVII.).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

When the war broke out, steps had been lately taken toward the creation in Rome, on the model of existing national historical institutions, of an Hungarian Historical Institute, on governmental foundation but helped by the munificence of Mgr. Fráknoi, and toward the enlargement of the existing Bohemian mission into a permanent Bohemian Historical Institute; but it is not known whether these projects can now be pursued.

Mr. George W. Robinson, secretary of the Harvard Graduate School, has prepared the first English translation of *Eugippius: the Life of Saint Severinus*, which may be had from the University Press.

P. Noailles, in the first part of his *Les Collections de Nouvelles de l'Empereur Justinien*, dealt with *Origine et Formation sous Justinien* (Paris, Recueil Sirey, 1912, pp. xx, 267), and in the second part has published *La Collection Grecque des 168 Nouvelles* (Bordeaux, Cadoret, 1914, pp. 212).

The period from 750 to the Concordat of Worms in 1122 is dealt with in the first volume, and the ensuing period to the middle of the fourteenth century in the second volume of E. Eichmann, *Kirche und Staat* (Paderborn, Schöningh, 1912, 1914) in *Quellensammlung zur Kirchlichen Rechtsgeschichte und zum Kirchenrecht*.

A Problem in the Use of Parallel Source Material in Medieval History: the Capture of Jerusalem in 1099, by Dr. Frederic Duncalf of the University of Texas, is a suggestive essay on the use of sources (*Bulletin of the University of Texas*, no. 224).

A recent publication of the Görres Gesellschaft is the first volume of F. E. Schneider, *Die Römische Rota* (Paderborn, Schöningh, 1914).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Seckel, *Studien zu Benedictus Levita*, VIII. (Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde, XXXIX. 2); De Boor, *Suidas und die Exzerptsammlung*,

II. (Byzantinische Zeitschrift, XXIII. 1); J. Martin, *Les Italiens en Grèce et dans les Iles après les Croisades* [conclusion] (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXVIII. 2); N. Paulus, *Der Hauptschädling des Ablasses im Mittelalter* (Historisches Jahrbuch, XXXV. 3).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

General review: W. Köhler, *Kirchengeschichte, Neuere Kirchengeschichte, Reformationszeit* (Theologische Rundschau, July, August).

The Arnold Prize Essay for 1914 is *Elizabeth and Henry IV.*, by J. B. Black, "a study in Anglo-French Relations, 1589-1603".

A recent volume by Sandonnini gives an account of *Il Generale Raimondo Montecuccoli e la sua Famiglia* (Modena, Ferraguti, 1914).

George G. Butler is the editor of *A Journal of the First Two Campaigns of the Seven Years' War* by Horace St. Paul, aide-de-camp and colonel of cavalry in the Austrian army (Cambridge University Press).

The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914, pp. xiii, 478), by Professor William E. Mead of Wesleyan University, combines in an uncommon degree interest and scholarship. Attention is centred on France, Italy, and Germany, with some reference to the Low Countries, Switzerland, and Spain. There are chapters on water travel, roads, carriages, inns, the cost of travel, its dangers and annoyances, and other topics, all supported by abundant citations of authorities, and illustrated from contemporary prints.

The fifth volume of Professor Oman's *History of the Peninsular War* (Oxford University Press) covers the years 1811-1812.

The August 1 issue of *La Civiltà Cattolica* was a number prepared in commemoration of the centenary of the restoration of the Society of Jesus in 1914. Among the volumes recently issued on the history of the society during the century are P. Albers, *Liber Saecularis, Historiae Societatis Jesu ab anno 1814 ad annum 1914* (Rome, 1914); J. Bournichon, *La Compagnie de Jésus en France, Histoire d'un Siècle* (vol. I., already mentioned, Paris, Beauchesne, 1914, pp. xlvii, 568); and P. Lesmes Frias, *La Provincia de España de la Compañía de Jesús, 1815-1863* (Madrid, Rivadeneyra, 1914, pp. 254). A comprehensive history of *I Gesuiti dalle Origini ai nostri Giorni* (Rome, *Civiltà Cattolica*, 1914, pp. 600) is the work of E. Rosa. All of the above authors are members of the society.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Griselle (*Le Prince de Galles et l'Alliance Anglaise au Temps de Henri IV. et de Louis XIII.* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXVIII. 1); G. Guillot, *Un Témoin Italien de la Guerre des Impériaux contre les Turcs, 1683* (*ibid.*); J. F. Chance, *The Treaty of Hanover* (English Historical Review, October); A. de Curzon, *L'Ambassade du Comte des Alleurs à Constantinople, 1747-1754*.

(Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXVIII. 3); A. Auzoux, *Un Incident Diplomatique entre l'Espagne et le Directoire, 1798-1799* (Revue des Études Historiques, May); L. B. Jackes, *Ghent and the Treaty* (Canadian Magazine, December); L. Pingaud, *Alexandre I^{er} et Metternich d'après les Rapports de Lebzeltern, 1816-1826* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXVIII. 2); A. Bourguet, *La France et la Russie de 1848 à 1854* (*ibid.*); E. Daudet, *À Travers les Origines d'une Guerre* [1870-1871] (Revue des Deux Mondes, September 15).

THE GREAT WAR

[An historical journal of scientific aims may hesitate to take note of the swarm of ephemeral publications which assume to relate the history of the present war before it is anywise possible to do so; but collections of official documents have a permanent value, and certain other books, from their character or the standing of their authors, seem to deserve that the student's attention should be directed to them.]

First in date among the collections of official documents relating to the outbreak of hostilities may be placed the British "White Paper", *Correspondence respecting the European Crisis* ("Papers by Command, 7467, Miscellaneous, No. 6, 1914"), despatches and telegrams bearing date from July 20 to August 4, and the supplements (Cd. 7445, 7596, "Miscellaneous, Nos. 8 and 10") containing Sir E. Goschen's despatch dated London, August 8, and that of Sir Maurice de Bunsen dated London, September 1. The octavo blue-book *Great Britain and the European Crisis* (pp. 144), contains all these together with speeches of Sir Edward Grey and Mr. Asquith, August 3-6. The German "White Book" was issued both in German and in an authorized English translation, *Germany's Reasons for War with Russia* (Berlin, Liebhheit), official narrative with documents. The Russian "Orange Book" appears in both French and English in the British publication *Documents respecting the Negotiations preceding the War, published by the Russian Government* (Cd. 7626, "Miscellaneous, No. 11"), the "Gray Paper" of Belgium in French and English, in *Diplomatic Correspondence respecting the War published by the Belgian Government* (Cd. 7627, "Miscellaneous, No. 12"). More recently the British government has also issued *Correspondence respecting Events leading to the Rupture of Relations with Turkey* (Cd. 7628, "Miscellaneous, No. 13"), and as we go to press we receive the French government's "Yellow Book", *Documents Diplomatiques*, etc., which takes a wider range than the preceding, especially with respect to events before July, 1914.

The "White Papers" of England and Germany, the "Orange Paper" of Russia and "Gray Paper" of Belgium, and some other diplomatic documents relating to the war, have been reprinted from the *New York*

Times in a convenient booklet. The *Times* also issues an English translation of the French "Yellow Book". The German book and nearly all of the Russian are reprinted in *Why We Are at War* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, pp. 251), by six members of the Oxford faculty of modern history.

The issues of *International Conciliation* for October and November (nos. 83 and 84) are occupied with official documents bearing upon the European war.

The English Historical Association has published, as Leaflet no. 36, *History of the Present War*, an eight-page bibliography for the use of teachers of history. Another, by Professor Clarence Perkins, appears in the *History Teacher's Magazine* for November.

Guerre de 1914: Documents Officiels, Textes, Législatifs et Réglementaires (Paris, Dalloz, 1914) is a pamphlet of the laws and ordinances especially applicable to France when entering upon the state of war. It will be supplemented by further issues. The historical section of the French General Staff issued near the outbreak of war a third edition of Lieutenant Jacomet, *Les Lois de la Guerre Continentale* (Paris, Fournier, 1914, pp. 160).

Professor Albert Bushnell Hart's *The War in Europe* (Appleton, pp. 254) is an excellent book of ~~the~~ class. In a plain and simple manner, adapted to the uses of the general reader, and in a clear arrangement, it treats of the resources, aims, and difficulties of the larger and smaller European powers, of considerations of race, and of military and economic rivalries, as conditions of the great struggle, and sets forth the manner in which the war began, the leading questions of international law and policy which are involved, and the probable results of the struggle to America and to the rest of the world. All is treated with wide and solid information, with sound judgment, with an excellent spirit of impartiality, and with restraint as to prediction.

Dr. J. Holland Rose has been delivering at Cambridge University a series of lectures on *The Origins of the War*, which have just been published by the University Press.

Gabriel Hanotaux is writing the text for an *Histoire Illustrée de la Guerre de 1914* (Paris, Nilsson) which is appearing in weekly parts at one franc each. A similar publication in sixty-centime parts is *Pages d'Histoire, 1914* (Paris, Berger-Levrault). The *Deutsche Geschichtskalender* is appearing with the subtitle *Der Europäische Krieg in Aktenmässiger Darstellung*, prepared by Dr. Friedrich Pöhlitz. The *Revue de Hongrie* (Budapest) beginning with September is "entièrement consacrée à la Guerre", and is a vehement presentation of the Austro-Hungarian views. The September issue of the *Süddeutsche Monatshefte* is a "Nationale Kundgebung Deutscher und Oesterreichischer Historiker", with articles by Marcks, Meinecke, Oncken, Lenz, and others.

A pamphlet entitled *Truth about Germany* having been issued by a committee of representative Germans, and having somewhat the status of an official German justification of the war, Mr. Douglas Sladen has issued in reply a volume entitled *The Real "Truth about Germany": Facts about the War*, which presents the paragraphs of the German publication in English translation and follows each paragraph with controverting comment. While in the main the book is merely controversial, and as such may be thought to fall outside the sphere of this journal, there are a sufficient number of documents quoted in the course of the debate to give the book, though published near the beginning of the war, a certain amount of historical value.

The Frederick A. Stokes Company have published in a small volume *Treitschke: Selections from Lectures on Politics*, intended to illustrate the influence of that historian and publicist upon German thought and upon the present war. Messrs. Putnam also have published a book on *Treitschke: his Life and Work*, by Adolf Hausrath, consisting of a critical and biographical sketch by this intimate friend, and of nine essays by Treitschke containing the essentials of his doctrine of German policy, the substance of which had already been made known to those who do not read German by the late Professor Cramb's four lectures entitled *Germany and England* (Dutton).

Several volumes on the relations between France and Germany were published within the year preceding the outbreak of the present war and possess a consequent interest. *France et Allemagne, 1870-1913* (Paris, Perrin, 1913, pp. viii, 307) is a good survey of events from the French point of view by R. Pinon. Other books are L. Bruneau, *L'Allemagne en France* (Paris, Plon, 1914, pp. 340); G. Aubert, *La Folie Franco-Allemande: Etude Contemporaine, 1914* (Paris, Flammarion, 1914, pp. xvi, 284); and M. Leroy, *L'Alsace-Lorraine, Porte de France, Porte d'Allemagne* (Paris, Ollendorff, 1914). To these may be added a volume on *France et Suisse* (Paris, Perrin, 1914) by H. Moro.

Some idea of the German view of England and of the rivalry between the two countries may be obtained from E. Sieper, *Die Wirtschaftliche Rivalität zwischen Deutschland und England* (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1914, pp. 21); from H. A. Walter, *Die Neuere Englische Sozial-Politik* (*ibid.*, pp. xxiv, 179), which has an introduction by Mr. Lloyd George, and is the sixth volume of Sieper's *Die Kultur des Modernen Englands*, a publication with pacifist tendencies; from W. Franz, *Britische Kulturkraft im Dienste National-Deutschen Arbeit* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1914, pp. iv, 67); and from M. Herggelet, *Ueber die Wahrscheinlichkeit eines Krieges zwischen Deutschland und England und über die Zukunft der beiden Länder* (Leipzig, Weigand, 1914, pp. 110), which is an attack on Sir Edward Grey, by a German who has lived fifteen years in England.

Rather more than the usual interest in a doctor's thesis attaches to *Die Neutralisation von Staaten insbesondere die der Schweiz, Belgiens, Luxemburgs, und des früheren Kongostaates* (Berlin, Rothschild, 1913, pp. xvii, 252), by S. Richter. *Die Grossmächte der Gegenwart* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1914, pp. iii, 208), by Professor J. R. Kjellén of the University of Gothenburg, is a good survey written just before the war. The problems of international law involved in *Des Cessions de Territoires envisagées dans leur Principe et dans leurs Effets relatifs au Changement de Souveraineté et de Nationalité* (Paris, Rivière, 1914, pp. 236) have been studied by M. Costes. The financial problems are dealt with in A. Landry and B. Nogaro, *La Crise des Finances Publiques en France, en Angleterre, en Allemagne* (Paris, Alcan, 1914), and M. Évesque, *Les Finances de Guerre au XX^e Siècle* (*ibid.*, pp. xi, 707), both of which appeared before the war. The labor side of the problem was discussed by P. Louis, *Le Syndicalisme Européen* (*ibid.*). Among the discussions of military problems which appeared shortly before the beginning of hostilities were *Études sur l'Avant-Guerre* (Paris, Chapelot, 1914) issued by the historical section of the French General Staff; and Lieutenant-Colonel H. Mordacq, *La Guerre au XX^e Siècle: Essais Stratégiques* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1914, pp. xiii, 304), the individual essays being entitled *Étude Théorique d'une Situation Stratégique; Les Prodromes de Moukden; La Stratégie et la Cavalerie; La Stratégie et les Places Fortes; Stratégie Navale et Stratégie Terrestre—la Doctrine une; and La Durée Probable de la Prochaine Guerre.*

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: X., *La Lotta Nazionale Serba fra gli Slavi Meridionali dell' Austria-Ungheria* (Nuova Antologia, October); H. Delbrück, *Die Kriegsgefahr* [dated 26 July] (Preussische Jahrbücher, August); Prince Kotschubei, *Das Problem der Triple-Entente: der Russische Gesichtspunkt* (*ibid.*, September); F. J. Schmidt, *Das Ethos des Politischen Gleichgewichtsgedankens* (*ibid.*, October).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

The *Second Report of the Royal Commission on Public Records*, marked as volume II., part I., of the Commission (Cd. 7544), a blue-book of great interest to historical students, treats, with the same intelligent care as its predecessor, the constitution and contents of various public archives situated outside the Public Record Office, the treatment and public use of their papers, and the publications which have been made from them, and concludes with important recommendations.

The Royal Historical Society has moved to more commodious quarters at 22 Russell Square, Bloomsbury, London. Its programme for the session 1914-1915 is as follows: "The Despenser War in Glamorgan", by J. Conway Davies; "The Causes of the Anglo-German Hostilities in 1914, from the historian's point of view", by Dr. G. W. Prothero; "A French Provincial Assembly during the League", by Maurice Wilkinson;

"Some Unpublished Privy Seal Docquets of the Civil War Time", by Hilary Jenkinson and H. Symonds; "The Spanish Municipal Administration in South America, 1500-1800", by F. A. Kirkpatrick; "The Errors of Macaulay in his Estimation of the Squires and Parsons of the Seventeenth Century", by the Rev. P. H. Ditchfield; "Some Correspondence between Queen Elizabeth and the Czars of Russia", by Madame Inna Lubimenko; "King's Scholars in History and Modern Languages at Oxford and Cambridge, 1724-1727", by Oscar Browning; "The Historical Side of the Old English Poem of Widsith", by Alfred Anscombe.

Leaflet no. 35 of the English Historical Association is *A Brief Bibliography of British Constitutional History*.

Students will heartily welcome the appearance of the first part (topographical) of the *Guide to the Reports on Collections of Manuscripts of Private Families, Corporations and Institutions in Great Britain and Ireland* issued by the Historical Manuscripts Commission through Wymans.

As one of the supplementary papers of the British Academy, the Oxford University Press issues *Roman Britain in 1913* (pp. 60, with 23 illustrations), by Professor F. Haverfield.

Among the announcements of the Cambridge University Press is a new edition of *Beowulf* by R. W. Chambers and *English Historical Documents of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries* by Miss F. E. Harmer.

Mr. Hilaire Belloc has written the introduction and narrative for *The Book of the Bayeux Tapestry*, presenting the complete work in a series of color facsimiles (Chatto and Windus, pp. xix, 76 plates).

The Clarendon Press is shortly to publish a collection of family charters and papers dating from 1232 to 1696, edited by Sir James Ramsay.

The second part of Professor Petit-Dutaillis's *Studies Supplementary to Stubbs's Constitutional History*, translated by W. T. Waugh and edited by Professor Tait, has recently been published by the Manchester University Press. This volume deals with the rising of 1381.

Miss Alice Greenwood is preparing a selection from the Paston Letters to be published by Messrs. Bell in *Bohn's Historical Library*.

Mr. G. P. Gooch has contributed to the *Home University Library* a study of *Political Thought in England: from Bacon to Locke* (Holt).

A work of some historical value, with a large accumulation of facts, is J. Wickham Legg's *English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement* (Longmans and Company).

John and Sarah, Duke and Duchess of Marlborough, 1660-1744, based on Unpublished Letters and Documents at Blenheim Palace, by Stuart J. Reid (John Murray), finds its chief value as a study of the

Duchess of Marlborough, the new material bearing on the life of the duke being slight.

Berkeley and Percival (Cambridge University Press) by Benjamin Rand, consists of the correspondence of George Berkeley, afterward Bishop of Cloyne, and Sir John Percival, afterward Earl of Egmont.

Volume III. of *The Life of Lord Beaconsfield*, the first two volumes of which were written by M. F. Monypenny, has been completed by Mr. G. E. Buckle and will soon be published by John Murray.

Sir George Forrest, director of records to the government of India, is the author of *The Life of Lord Roberts, K. G., V. C.*, which was published but a short time before Lord Roberts's death.

G. Güttler has investigated the political theories and history of the labor movement in England in *Die Englische Arbeiterpartei* (Jena, Fischer, 1914, pp. x, 210). A local phase of the labor situation is the subject of *Londres et les Ouvriers de Londres* (Paris, Colin, 1914) by D. Pasquet.

The first series of the *Historical Records of Australia*, published by the Library Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament, will contain governors' despatches and instructions to and from England. One large volume has recently been issued covering the period 1788-1796.

The *Victorian Historical Magazine* for June contains a chatty article on "Scraps of Early Melbourne History, 1835-1839", by Thomas O'Callaghan, and the continuation of Edward A. Petherick's "Bibliography of the State of Victoria"; by way of documentary material is published a report of June, 1837, on the proposed mail route from Yass to Port Phillip.

British government publications: *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, Henry VII., vol. I., 1485-1494, ed. J. G. Black and R. H. Brodie; *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, Elizabeth, January-June, 1583, and Addenda*, ed. A. J. Butler and Sophie C. Lomas; *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, Elizabeth, July, 1583-July, 1584*, ed. Sophie C. Lomas; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1 March-31 December 1678, with Addenda, 1674-1679*, ed. F. H. Blackburne Daniell; *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, third series, vol. VI., 1678-1680, ed. P. Hume Brown (Edinburgh, H. M. General Register House).

Other documentary publications: *Caithness and Sutherland Records*, vol. I., part VIII., 1422-1445 (29 Ashburnham Mansions, Chelsea); *Old-Lore Miscellany of Orkney, Shetland, Caithness, and Sutherland*, vol. VII., part IV. (*ibid.*); *Nottingham Records*, extracts from the archives of the corporation of Nottingham, vol. VI., 1702-1760.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Rösler, *Erziehung in England vor der Normannischen Eroberung* (Englische Studien, XLVIII. 1); H. L. Gray, *The Commutation of Villein Services in England before the Black Death* (English Historical Review, October); Lord Sheffield, *Les*

Relations Historiques Modernes entre l'Angleterre et l'Irlande (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXVIII, 3); Charlotte Lady Blennerhasset, *Das Viktorianische England* [conclusion] (Deutsche Rundschau, August, September); E. Laskine, *Zur Geschichte des Sozialen Toryismus* (Archiv für die Geschichte der Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung, V. 1); J. D. Mackie, *Scotland and the Spanish Armada* (Scottish Historical Review, October); G. Neilson, *Scotstarvet's "Trew Relation"*, IV. (*ibid.*).

FRANCE

General review: P. Courteault, *Bulletin du Sud-Ouest, 1911-1913* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October).

The *Correspondance du Maréchal de Vivonne relative à l'Expédition de Messine* is being edited by J. Cordey for the Society of the History of France. The documents in the first volume belong to the years 1674-1676 (Paris, Renouard, 1914, pp. 424). For the Society of Diplomatic History, L. Delavaud has edited a volume of *Documents du Marquis de Pomponne, Ambassadeur et Secrétaire d'État, 1618-1699* (Paris, Plon, 1911, pp. xx, 369) which was not actually published until last July. F. Scheichl is the author of *Der Malteserritter und Generalleutnant Jakob Bretel von Grémonville, der Gesandte Ludwigs des Vierzehnten am Wiener Hofe von 1664 bis 1673, der Mann mit der Schwarzen Maske* (Berlin, Ebering, 1914). R. Gleizes has written from contemporary documents *Jean le Vacher, Vicaire Apostolique et Consul de France à Tunis et à Alger, 1619-1683* (Paris, Gabalda, 1914, pp. xvi, 296).

In the edition of the works of Bossuet for the series of *Les Grands Écrivains de la France* (Paris, Hachette) which is being edited by C. Urbain and E. Levesque, the *Correspondance* has reached 1696 in the seventh volume, while the first volume of *Oeuvres Oratoires* covers the period 1648-1654. H. Brémond, *Bossuet* (Paris, Plon, 1914) in the *Bibliothèque Française, XVII^e Siècle*, contains a biographical sketch with selections from the works of Bossuet. *Bossuet et Louis XIV., 1662-1704* (Paris, Champion, 1914, pp. 128) is a brilliant essay by Professor A. Gazier.

The fifth series of *Paris sous Louis XV., Rapports des Inspecteurs de Police au Roi* (Paris, Mercure de France, 1914), by C. Piton, contains the notes and the index. P. Hildenfinger has brought out a volume of *Documents sur les Juifs à Paris au XVIII^e Siècle, Actes d'Inhumation et Scellés* (Paris, Champion, 1914, pp. viii, 290) for the Société de l'Histoire de Paris et de l'Île de France.

Professor Marcel Marion of the College of France has dealt with the years 1715-1789 in the first volume of *Histoire Financière de la France depuis 1715* (Paris, Rousseau, 1914). A volume on *Necker Économiste* (Paris, Rivière, 1914, pp. 316) is by C. Vacher de Lapouge.

A publication of the historical section of the general staff by Captain A. Latreille deals with the period from 1761 to 1789 under the title, *L'Armée et la Nation à la Fin de l'Ancien Régime, les Derniers Ministres de la Guerre de la Monarchie* (Paris, Chapelot, 1914, pp. xv, 460).

Professor H. E. Bourne is shortly publishing through the Century Company *The French Revolution and the Napoleonic Era*, a volume in the same series as Professor Hazen's *Europe since 1815* (edited by Professor Haskins).

As scarcely anything has been published describing the situation and feelings in the provinces at the moment of the assembling of the States General in 1789, there is peculiar interest attaching to the *Journal Historique de ce qui s'est passé en l'Hôtel de Ville de Rouen à l'Occasion des États Généraux du Royaume tenus à Versailles au Mois de Mai, 1789* (Rouen, Laine, 1914, pp. 46), edited by C. Poullain, from the manuscript in the municipal archives of Rouen. A discussion of *Les Origines de la Guerre de Vendée* (Paris, Champion, 1914, pp. viii, 282), by H. Jagot, appears as the tenth volume of the *Bibliothèque de la Révolution et de l'Empire*. E. Labadie has published numerous facsimiles in a little volume on *Les Billets de Confiance émis par les Caisses Patriotiques du Département de la Gironde, 1791-1793* (Bordeaux, Mollat, 1914, pp. 138); A. Leclère has issued the volume for 1790 in his exhaustive history of *La Révolution à Alençon* (Paris, Leroux, 1914, pp. xvii, 268). R. de la Giraudière has written a brief article on *Une Petite Commune Rurale de Sologne pendant la Révolution, 1792-1805* (Orléans, Gont, 1914, pp. 24); and there are volumes on *Thuret* (Riom, Jouvet, 1913, pp. 236) by J. Berriat-Saint-Prix, and on *Saint Ouen* (Paris, Champion, n. d., pp. 330) by H. Perradeau.

In a review of O. G. de Heidenstam, *Marie Antoinette, Fersen, et Barnave, leur Correspondance* (Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1913) by Professor Hans Glagau in *Internationale Monatsschrift*, VIII. 621-638, the authenticity of the letters, which purport to have been preserved by the Fersen family in the chateau of Löfstad, Sweden, is attacked. At the request of Heidenstam two Swedish librarians, C. M. Stenbock and Carl Grönblad, made an investigation and reported favorably to the authenticity in the June issue of the *Internationale Monatsschrift*, to which Professor Glagau replies at length in the same number, defending his original position and adducing new arguments to sustain his attack. Judgment must be suspended pending the presentation of indubitable proofs, which Heidenstam should lose no time in offering.

E. Welvert has edited from the notes and papers of Theodore de Lameth, the brother of the famous brothers Lameth of the Constituent Assembly and himself a member of the Legislative Assembly, a volume of *Mémoires*, and another of *Notes et Souvenirs* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1913, 1914). J. de Dampierre has edited *Mémoires de Barthélemy, 1768-1819*

(Paris, Plon, 1914, pp. xvi, 439); and G. Lacour-Gayet, *Mémoires du Vice-Amiral Baron Grivel, Révolution, Empire* (*ibid.*, pp. vii, 423).

Lieutenant Ducournau has dealt with the period of the Constituent Assembly in the first volume of *Le Pouvoir Législatif et l'Armée sous la Révolution* (Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1913, pp. 190). A volume on *Les Sociétés Populaires et l'Armée, 1791-1794* (Paris, Daragon, 1913, pp. 207) is by P. Dufay. The first series of Commandant G. Dumont, *Études sur l'Armée pendant la Révolution*, relates to 1791, *Bataillons de Volontaires Nationaux, Cadres et Historiques* (Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1914, pp. 480). Captain S. Vialla has issued the first volume of *L'Armée Nationale: les Volontaires des Bouches-du-Rhône, 1791-1792* (Paris, Chapelot, 1914); Colonel E. Picard, *Au Service de la Nation, Lettres de Volontaires, 1792-1798* (Paris, Alcan, 1914); and R. Brice, a work of sober research on *La Femme et les Armées de la Révolution et de l'Empire, 1792-1815* (Paris, Ambert, 1914, pp. 363).

Bernadotte: the First Phase (1763-1799), by D. Plunkett Barton (John Murray) is an admirable study which the author hopes hereafter to supplement by a work on Bernadotte's later life.

The following recent publications relating to the Reign of Terror deserve to be enumerated: E. Seligman, *La Justice en France pendant la Révolution, 1791-1793* (Paris, Plon, 1913), continuing his earlier work; Abbé A. C. Sabatié, *Le Tribunal Révolutionnaire, Origine, Évolution, Principaux Procès, ses Victimes dans le Clergé* (Paris, Lethielleux, 1914, pp. xx, 640); E. Daudet, *De la Terreur au Consulat, Récits Romanesques et Tragiques en Marge des Temps Révolutionnaires* (Paris, Émile-Paul, 1914, pp. iii, 293); and G. Gautherot, *Le Vandalisme Jacobin, Destructions Administratives d'Archives, d'Objets d'Art, de Monuments Religieux à l'Époque Révolutionnaire, d'après des Documents Originaux en grande Partie inédits* (Paris, Beauchesne, 1914, pp. xv, 368).

Only very recently have the French undertaken to study their departmental administrative system and its history. The creation and organization of the departments in 1789-1790 and the vicissitudes and modifications of their administration under the Revolution, the Empire, and the Restoration afford a wealth of good material which, in part, has been used in the following recent publications: G. Maurion, *La Formation du Département de la Seine-Inférieure* (Paris, Recueil Sirey, 1913, pp. 229); E. Couard, *L'Administration Départementale de Seine-et-Oise, 1790-1913* (Versailles, Aubert, 1913, pp. xi, 476); C. Faure, *Le Département de la Drôme de 1800 à 1802* (Valence, Céas, 1913, pp. 254); P. Viard, *L'Administration Préfectorale dans le Département de la Côte-d'Or sous le Consulat et le Premier Empire* (Paris, Champion, 1914, pp. 390); and Abbé J. Moulard, *Lettres inédites du Comte Camille de Tournon, Préfet de Rome, 1809-1814, Première Partie, la Politique et l'Esprit Public* (Paris, Champion, 1914, pp. xvi, 287); and *Le Comte Camille de Tournon, Préfet de la Gironde, 1815-1822* (*ibid.*, pp. xxxix, 586).

F. M. Kircheisen has issued the second and third volumes of *Napoleon I.; sein Leben und seine Zeit* (Munich, Müller, 1914), and his wife, Gertrude Kircheisen, the first volume of *Napoleon und die Seinen* (*ibid.*). C. Cherfils has written an essay on *Bonaparte et l'Islam* (Paris, Giard and Brière, 1913). P. Holzhausen, *Paris sous le Consulat* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1914, pp. xi, 262), translated from the German by Commandant Minart, and Prince Charles de Clary et Aldringen, *Trois Mois à Paris lors du Mariage de l'Empereur Napoléon I^{er} et de l'Archiduchesse Marie Louise* (Paris, Plon, 1914, pp. xvi, 428), edited by Baron de Mitis and Count de Pimodan, give the views of foreign observers.

Col. Vachée's *Napoléon en Campagne*, mentioned heretofore in these pages, has been translated into English and published by the Macmillan Company under the title *Napoleon at Work*.

With the eighth volume the *Lettres et Documents pour servir à l'Histoire de Joachim Murat, 1767-1815* (Paris, Plon, 1914), edited by Prince Murat, have reached August 5, 1810. Some *Lettres de Dupont d'Herval, Chef d'Etat-Major de la Grande Armée* (Paris, Chapelot, 1914, pp. 154) have been published by A. Vaillant. Recent publications of memoirs by personages of the Napoleonic period include *Mémoires du Comte Roger de Damas, Vienne de 1806 à 1814* (2 vols., Paris, Plon, 1914), edited by J. Rambaud; *Mémoires du Général Bro, 1796-1844* (*ibid.*, pp. 314), edited by Baron Henry Bro de Comères; and Captain J. C. Friederich, *Mémoires d'un Mort, 1805-1828* (3 vols., Paris, Librairie Universelle, 1913). The third volume of General H. Bonnal's *Vie Militaire du Maréchal Ney* (Paris, Chapelot, 1914) has appeared. A. de La Valette Monbrun, *Essai de Biographie Historique et Psychologique, Maine de Biran, 1766-1824* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1914, pp. viii, 544); J. Turquan, *La Générale Junot, Duchesse d'Abrantès, 1784-1838* (Paris, Tallandier, 1914); and Baron A. de Maricourt, *La Duchesse d'Orléans, la Mère de Louis Philippe, la Révolution, l'Exil, les Dernières Années* (Paris, Émile-Paul, 1914) are among the new biographies for the period.

Contemporary views of the July Monarchy and the Second Empire are furnished by E. Daudet's editions of the *Journal du Comte Rodolphe Apponyi, Attaché de l'Ambassade d'Autriche à Paris, 1826-1850* (vol. III., Paris, Plon, 1914, pp. 520), and of the *Journal de Victor de Balabine, Secrétaire de l'Ambassade de Russie à Paris de 1842 à 1852* (vol. I., Paris, Émile-Paul, 1914); and by Léon Molinos, *Quelques Souvenirs d'un Octogénaire* (Paris, Plon, 1914).

Correspondence with his wife and with most of the important contemporary statesmen of France appears in the *Lettres de Jules Ferry, 1846-1893* (Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1914). The presidency of Thiers is the subject of the second volume of A. Claveau, *Souvenirs Politiques et Parlementaires* (Paris, Plon, 1914, pp. iii, 474). A varied career in French affairs is revealed in Count de Maugny, *Cinquante Ans de Sou-*

venirs, 1859-1909 (ibid.). Jérôme and Jean Tharaud describe another checkered career in *La Vie et la Mort de Paul Deroulède* (Paris, Émile-Paul, 1914, pp. 264). *Das Französische Geldwesen im Kriege, 1870-1878* (Strassburg, Trübner, 1913, pp. xii, 525) was presented by F. Gutmann, as his thesis for the doctorate at the University of Strassburg. A. Siegfried, *Tableau Politique de la France de l'Ouest sous la 3^e République* (Paris, Alcan, 1914); A. Lods, *La Nouvelle Législation des Cultes Protestants en France, 1905-1913* (Paris, Fischbacher, 1914); and Professor Le Fur, *Le Protectorat de la France sur les Catholiques d'Orient et la Reprise de nos Relations avec le Saint-Siège* (Paris, Pedone, 1914) are other new publications relating to the Third Republic.

Some phases of the political agitation in France in the months preceding the present war are shown in L. Dimier, *L'Action Libérale dans les Élections* (Paris, Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, 1914, pp. 310); the second edition of G. Valois, *La Monarchie et la Classe Ouvrière (ibid., pp. clx, 400)*; and J. L. de Lanessan, former minister of marine, *La Crise de la République* (Paris, Alcan, 1914).

The militarist agitation in France during the months preceding the present war may be studied, in part, in L. de Montesquiou, *1870, les Causes Politiques du Désastre* (Paris, Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, 1914, pp. 288); C. Maurras, *Kiel et Tanger, 1895-1905; la République Française devant l'Europe, Nouvelle Édition revue et augmentée d'une Préface de 1905 à 1913 (ibid., pp. cxviii, 433)*; which is a rejoinder to Marcel Sembat, *Faites un Roi, sinon Faites la Paix*, in reply to the first edition; C. Maurras, *Enquête sur la Monarchie (ibid., pp. lvi, 565)*; J. Bainville, *Le Coup d'Agadir et la Guerre d'Orient; Lutttes et Conflits de la Triple Entente et de la Triplice, la Politique des Grandes Monarchies Autoritaires du XX^e Siècle, Décadence du Libéralisme et l'Avenir de la Réaction dans l'Europe Contemporaine (ibid., pp. ix, 324)*; Colonel Debon, *Notre Parlementarisme et la Défense Nationale en 1914* (Paris, Figuière, 1914); and A. Mévil, *La Paix est Malade* (Paris, Plon, 1914).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. de Launay, *Le Combat de Perigny, Août 52 av. C.* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July); M. Tangl, *Die Epoche Pippins* (Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde, XXXIX. 2); J. Morize, *Aigues-Mortes au XIII^e Siècle* (Annales du Midi, July); L. Mirot, *L'Enlèvement du Dauphin et le Premier Conflit entre Jean sans Peur et Louis d'Orléans, Juillet-Octobre, 1405 [conclusion]* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July, October); H. Prutz, *Die Briefe Jeanne d'Arcs* (Sitzungsberichte der K. Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl., 1914, 1); M. Sepet, *Observations Critiques sur l'Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc, la Relation Officielle du Procès de Condamnation et la Diplomatie de l'Angleterre* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); M. Prevost, *L'Assistance aux Invalides de la Guerre avant 1670 (ibid.)*; E. Divoff, *Paris pendant le Consulat, I.* (Revue de Paris, August 1); G. Labouchère,

Un Financier Diplomate au Siècle Dernier, Pierre-César Labouchère, 1772-1839 [conclusion] (*Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique*, XXVIII. 1); L. Polier, *La France en Égypte* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, August 1); H. Welschinger, *Souvenirs de Bordeaux, 1871-1914*, I. (*ibid.*, November 1).

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

In the *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, P. F. Kehr has issued the second part of the sixth volume of *Italia Pontificia* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1914, pp. xxxvii, 392) dealing with Piedmont and Liguria.

Various phases of the history of the Dark Ages in Italy are treated in G. Salvioli, *Storia Economica d'Italia nell' Alto Medio Evo, le Nostri Origini* (Naples, Detken and Rocholl, 1913); F. Tarducci, *L'Italia dalla Discesa di Alboino alla Morte di Agilulfo* (Città di Castello, Lapi, 1914); and G. H. Hörle, *Frühmittelalterliche Mönchs- und Klerikerbildung in Italien, Geistliche Bildungsideale vom 6. bis 9. Jahrhundert* (Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1914, pp. xii, 88) which deals with south Italy, Naples, Ravenna, and the Greek colony in Rome and shows the lingering of Greek speech and influence in Italy. The fifth part of L. Schiaparelli, *I Diplomi dei Re d'Italia* (Rome, Tip. del Senato, 1914, pp. 255) contains the diplomas of Hugh and Lothaire. The same editor has co-operated with F. Baldasseroni in the issue of the third volume of *Regesta di Camaldoli* (Rome, Loescher, 1914, pp. viii, 397).

A work entitled *Life and Letters of the Italian Renaissance* by Christopher Hare is announced by Messrs. Stanley Paul.

G. Jalla, *Storia della Riforma in Piemonte fino alla Morte di Emanuele Filiberto, 1517-1580* (Florence, Lib. Claudiana, 1914, pp. iv, 411); C. Contessa, *I Regni di Napoli e di Sicilia nelle Aspirazioni Italiane di Vittorio Amedeo II. di Savoia, 1700-1713* (Turin, Bocca, 1914, pp. 139); and C. Bandini, *Roma e la Nobiltà Romana nel Tramonto del Secolo XVIII.* (Città di Castello, Lapi, 1914, pp. xvi, 389) are recent monographs on modern Italian history.

In addition to A. Sartorius, Freiherr von Waltershausen, *Die Sizilianische Agrarverfassung und ihre Wandlungen, 1780-1912, eine Sozialpolitische und Wirtschaftliche Untersuchung* (Leipzig, Deichert, 1913, pp. xii, 385), the following monographs on the revolutionary and Napoleonic periods in Italy have recently appeared: P. Cardona, *La Sicilia durante la 1^a e 2^a Coalizione contro la Francia, 1793-1801* (Catania, Giannotta, 1914); A. Simioni, *La Congiura Giacobina del 1794 a Napoli* (Naples, Pierro, 1914, pp. 129); L. F. A. Peracca, *L'Alta Valle di Susa dal 1789 al 1804, la Rivoluzione Francese, la Repubblica Cisalpina, il Consolato di Napoleone* (Turin, Massaro, 1914, pp. 198); G. Rizzardo, *Il Patriarcato di Venezia durante il Regno Napoleonico, 1806-1814* (Venice, Ferrari, 1914, pp. 119); T. Baldi, *Un Episodio della Politica Ecclesiastica di Napoleone: a Proposito della Elezione del Vescovo di Nancy*

ad arcivescovo di Firenze, 1810-1814 (Florence, Seeber, 1914, pp. 129); and E. Piola-Caselli, *Un Ministro Toscano al Congresso di Vienna, 1814-1815* (Pistoia, Tip. Cooperativa, 1914, pp. 138).

The development of secret societies in Italy under the Restoration is shown in A. Baretta, *Le Società Segrete in Toscana, 1814-1824* (Turin, Unione, 1913, pp. viii, 175), and in Zara, *La Carboneria in Terra d'Otranto, 1820-1830* (Turin, Bocca, 1914). M. degli Alberti is using the papers of Count Bertone di Sambuy in the preparation of *La Politica Estera del Piemonte sotto Carlo Alberto* (*ibid.*, pp. 380), of which the first volume deals with the-years 1835-1838. G. Leti has published a liberally illustrated volume on *La Rivoluzione e la Repubblica Romana, 1843-1849* (Milan, Vallardi, 1913, pp. xv, 531).

Messrs. Doran have published the third volume of their translation of the *Memoirs of Francesco Crispi*, covering the period of the formation and early history of the Triple Alliance.

During the past four years, Senator T. Palamenghi-Crispi has been publishing from the family papers a series of volumes of materials relating to the career of Francesco Crispi, under the following titles: *I Mille* (Milan, Treves, 1911, pp. 409); *Carteggi Politici inediti, 1860-1900* (Rome, 1912); *Politica Estera, Memorie e Documenti* (Milan, Treves, 1912), for the period 1876 to 1890; *Questioni Internazionali, Diario e Documenti* (ditto, pp. 300), supplementing the previous volume; *Ultimi Scritti e Discorsi Extraparlamentari, 1891-1901* (Rome, 1913), continuing *Scritti e Discorsi Politici, 1849-1890* (Rome, 1890; second ed., Turin, s. d.); and *La Prima Guerra d'Africa* (Milan, Treves, 1914, pp. xii, 419).

Italy's Foreign and Colonial Policy: a Selection from the Speeches delivered in the Italian Parliament by the Italian Foreign Affairs Minister Senator Tommaso Tittoni during his Six Years of Office (1903-1909), the English translation by Baron Bernardo Quaranta di San Severino (Smith, Elder, and Company), contains valuable material for any study of the diplomatic history of the years in question.

Isabella the Catholic, by Mrs. Julia Cartwright, has been added to the *Heroes of the Nations* series.

Two volumes of the writings of the second Viscount de Santarem, newly published for gratuitous distribution by the present viscount, have already been noted in this REVIEW (XVIII. 656). A third volume, entitled *2º Visconde de Santarem: Ineditos (Miscellanea)* (Lisbon, Imprensa Libanio da Silva, 1914, pp. 583), contains a mass of historical, geographical, biographical, bibliographical, and archival information, largely relating to the history of Portuguese explorations and discoveries. Besides many brief notes the book also includes some memoirs, of which the longest is entitled "Vinda de parte da Familia Real Hespanhola para Portugal e suas consequencias" (pp. 1-62). The editor,

Jordão de Freitas, promises further volumes, with material for continuations of Santarem's *Essai sur l'Histoire de la Cosmographie pendant le Moyen Âge* and of his *Quadro Elementar*.

A. Pellizzari has collected a series of studies and essays mostly on Renaissance subjects in *Portogallo e Italia nel Secolo XVI*. (Naples, Perrella, 1914, pp. 338). B. Romano has issued a book on *L'Espulsione dei Jesuiti dal Portogallo* (Città di Castello, Lapi, 1914, pp. 125); and P. Lebesgue, on *La République Portugaise* (Paris, Sansot, 1914, pp. 307).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. H. Haskins, *Moses of Bergamo* (Byzantinische Zeitschrift, XXIII. 1); R. Palmarocchi, *Le Riforme di Gioacchino Murat nel Primo Anno di Regno* (Archivio Storico Italiano, LXXII. 1); F. Gentili, *La Relazione dell' Ambascieria di Mons. Morichini a Vienna nel 1848 e sua Genesi* (Rassegna Contemporanea, August 10); M. Mazziotti, *Lettere Politiche di un Intimo Amico del Conte di Cavour* (Nuova Antologia, October); P. Buscalione, *Cavour e la Massoneria* (Rassegna Contemporanea, July 25); Marquis J. N. Pepoli, *La Question Romaine, 1856-1860* [conclusion] (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXVIII. 1, 2); Anonymous, *Le Pontificat de Pie X.* (Revue des Deux Mondes, September 15); G. A. di Cesarò, *Le Responsabilità del Marchese di S. Giuliano* (Rassegna Contemporanea, October 10); F. Mendizábal, *Investigaciones acerca del Origen, Historia, y Organización de la Real Chancillería de Valladolid, su Jurisdicción y Competencia, I-IV.* (Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas, y Museos, January, March, May, July); F. M. Angel, *La Vie Franciscaine en Espagne entre les Deux Couronnements de Charles-Quint ou le Premier Commissaire Général des Provinces Franciscaines des Indes Occidentales, VI.* (*ibid.*, July); M. Hume, *Las Reinas de la España Antigua, Juana la Loca, María Tudor, Isabel de la Paz (Isabel de Valois)* (La España Moderna, June-October); C. Cambroneró, *La Reina Gobernadora, Crónicas Políticas de 1833 a 1840, IV.* (*ibid.*, October).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

Two phases of Pan-Germanism are manifested and studied in C. Müller, *Altgermanische Meeresherrschaft* (Gotha, Perthes, 1914, pp. xii, 487), which treats the period prior to 1200, including the Scandinavian as well as the Teutonic peoples; and in A. Zimmermann, *Geschichte der Deutschen Kolonialpolitik* (Berlin, Mittler, 1914, pp. xvi, 336).

The fourth and fifth editions of the late R. Koser's *Geschichte Friedrichs des Grossen* have been concluded with a fourth volume (Stuttgart, Cotta, 1914, pp. 175) containing the appendixes, bibliography, and index. There is a biography of *Der Prinz von Preussen August Wilhelm als Politiker* (Berlin, Ebering, 1913); and one by B. Rosenmöller of *Schulenberg-Kehnert unter Friedrich den Grossen* (Berlin, Rothschild, 1914). The valuable manuscript of A. H. Lucanus, in the library of the University of Königsberg, describing *Preussens Uralter und Heutiger Zu-*

stand, 1748 (2 vols., Lötzen, Sommerfeldt, 1913, pp. viii, 16, 451; viii, 363) is a mine of historical, geographical, ethnographical, and statistical information collected by a judicial official under Frederick William I. and Frederick the Great. It deals with West Prussia as well as with East Prussia and will be consulted by students of Prussian history along with L. von Baczko, *Handbuch der Geschichte, Erdbeschreibung, und Statistik Preussens* (Königsberg, 1802-1803).

The third volume concludes *Preussens Heer von seinen Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Berlin, Mittler, 1914, pp. xxv, 543) by O. Freiherr von der Osten-Sacken und von Rhein. The part relating to 1813 in *Das Preussische Heer der Befreiungskriege* (*ibid.*, pp. viii, 645) has been issued by the military history section of the German General Staff.

The year 1914 saw the publication of a notable group of works on the growth and spread of political ideas in Germany during the first half of the nineteenth century. G. F. Preuss wrote on *Die Quellen des Nationalgeistes der Befreiungskriege* (Berlin, Mittler); P. Herre, on *Von Preussens Befreiungs- und Verfassungskampf, aus den Papieren des Oberburggrafen Magnus von Brünneck* (*ibid.*, pp. ix, 501); Meisner, on *Die Lehre vom Monarchischen Prinzip im Zeitalter der Restauration und des Deutschen Bundes* (Breslau, Marcus); A. Fichert, on *Montesquieus und Rousseaus Einfluss auf den Vormärzlichen Liberalismus Badens* (Leipzig, pp. viii, 112); and K. Buchheim, on *Die Stellung der Kölnischen Zeitung im Vormärzlichen Rheinischen Liberalismus* (Leipzig, Voigtländer, pp. xi, 430).

Several items relating to German historians of the nineteenth century possess an historical as well as a merely biographical interest. E. Waitz has written a *Lebens- und Charakterbild George Waitz, zu seinem Hundertjährigen Geburtstag* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1913, pp. 100); A. Lübke, a monograph on *Friedrich von Gentz und Heinrich von Sybel: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Neueren Historiographie* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1913), and Rittinghaus, a study of *Die Kunst der Geschichtschreibung Heinrich von Treitschkes* (Leipzig, Voigtländer, 1914). Treitschke's *Briefe* are being edited by Max Cornicelius and published by Hirzel of Leipzig.

R. C. T. Eigenbrodt, *Meine Erinnerungen aus den Jahren 1848, 1849, und 1850* (Darmstadt, Staatsverlag, 1914, pp. iv, 58, 374) is a valuable detailed chronicle which was read in manuscript and annotated by Heinrich von Gagern. The editor, L. Bergsträsser, has written an excellent biographical introduction for this volume published in the *Quellen und Forschungen* for grand-ducal Hesse.

W. Schröder, *Handbuch der Sozialdemokratischen Parteitage von 1863 bis 1909* (Munich, Birk, 1914, pp. 591) presents in useful form a mass of material relating to the history of the social-democratic party. The first volume of W. Blos, *Denkwürdigkeiten eines Sozialdemokraten*

(*ibid.*, pp. vii, 287), is interesting though it gives but little new information.

Le Reichstag Impérial, 1871-1912; Étude de Démographie Politique (Paris, 1914) by Paul Meuriot; and *Die Deutsche Volkswirtschaft und ihre Wandlungen im letzten Vierteljahrhundert* (2 vols., Munich, Gladbach, 1914) by Georg Neuhaus are scholarly investigations.

Some of the conditions in medieval Frankfort are portrayed in K. Bücher, *Die Berufe der Stadt Frankfurt a. M. im Mittelalter* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1914, pp. 143) in the *Abhandlungen* of the Saxon Academy, and in I. Kracauer, *Urkunden zur Geschichte der Juden von Frankfurt a. M., 1150-1400* (vol. I., Frankfort, Kauffmann, 1914). H. Dechent deals with a later period in his *Kirchengeschichte von Frankfurt a. M. seit der Reformation* (vol. I., Frankfort, Kesselring, 1914). The archaeological institute of Frankfort has published a volume of notable excellence and value by Georg Wolff on *Die Südliche Wetterau in Vor- und Frühgeschichtlicher Zeit* (Frankfort, Ravenstein, 1913, pp. 196) which relates to the environs of the city.

The commission for modern Austrian history has recently issued the third volume of L. Bittner, *Chronologisches Verzeichnis der Oesterreichischen Staatsverträge* (Vienna, Holzhausen, 1914).

Krauter's volume on *Franz Freiherr von Ottenfels* (Salzburg, Pustet, 1914) throws some light on the obscure subject of Metternich's policy and relations with the Greek war for independence. Ottenfels was ambassador at Constantinople during the period.

Messrs. Appleton are soon to issue *Francis Joseph and his Times* by Sir Horace Rumbold, who for four years was British ambassador in Vienna.

Hans Barth has begun the publication of a *Bibliographie der Schweizer Geschichte enthaltend die selbständig erschienenen Druckwerke zur Geschichte der Schweiz bis Ende 1912*, of which the first volume contains *Quellen und Bearbeitungen nach der Folge der Begebenheiten* (Basel, Basler Buch- und Antiquariatshandlung, xviii, 529). The work is published in the *Quellen zur Schweizer Geschichte* of the Allgemeine Geschichtsforschende Gesellschaft.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Krammer, *Die Frage des Laienkurrechts vom Interregnum bis zum Goldenen Bulle* (Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde, XXXIX. 2); A. Martin, *Geschichte der Tanzkrankheit in Deutschland* (Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde, XXIV. 2, 3); H. Barge, *Zur Genesis der Frühreformatorischen Vorgänge in Wittenberg* (Historische Vierteljahrsschrift, XXV. 1); L. Bergstrasser, *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der Berliner Märztage* (*ibid.*); R. Fester, *Die Genesis der Emser Depesche* [conclusion] (Deutsche Rundschau, August); F. Mehring, *Engels und*

Marx (Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung, V. 1); R. Peschke, *Moltke als Politiker* (Preussische Jahrbücher, October); P. Rohrbach, *L'Évolution de l'Allemagne comme Puissance Mondiale* (Revue Politique Internationale, July); A. Dürrwaechter, *Zur Bayerischen Geschichte unter Ferdinand Maria und Max Emanuel* (Historisches Jahrbuch, XXXV. 3); A. Domanovsky, *Zur Frage der Thronfolge im Zeitalter der Arpáden* (Ungarische Rundschau, July); T. Ortway, *Die Schlacht von Mohács; ihre Ursachen und Folgen* (*ibid.*).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

A. Oppermann is the editor of a new series of *Bijdragen van het Instituut voor Middeleeuwse Geschiedenis der Rijks-Universiteit te Utrecht* of which the first volume is N. B. Tenhaeff, *Diplomatische Studien over Utrechtsche Oorkonden der X^e tot XII^e Eeuw* (Utrecht, Oosthoek, 1914); and the second, H. P. Coster, *De Kroniek van Johannes de Beka, haar Bronnen en haar Eerste Redactie* (*ibid.*, pp. 302). Beka was a Utrecht chronicler of the fourteenth century whose narrative extended from the time of Willibrod to 1346. The chronicle was first printed in 1611, and there is a continuation to 1524.

M. Joseph Cuvelier, general archivist of the kingdom of Belgium, began with the year 1914 the publication of an annual entitled *Les Archives de l'État en Belgique* (pp. 537). It was planned, and, as it will now seem, very fortunately planned, that the initial volume, for 1914, should contain not merely the year's reports of work and accessions, for the General Archives at Brussels and for each of the eight state archives in the provinces, but a tabular statement of the contents of each and of its printed inventories, the whole making a manual or guide of much value to the historical worker.

The *Bulletin* of the Belgian Commission Royale d'Histoire, LXXXIII. 1, consists almost entirely of a critical examination of the Anchin continuation of Sigebert of Gembloux (important for the years 1150-1200), by Dr. P. Kath. The Commission has also published *Les Archives Farnésiennes de Parme* (pp. 164), treated from the point of view of Belgian history, by Professor L. Van der Essen of Louvain, and the first part of M. Léo Verriest's *Les Archives Départementales du Nord à Lille* (pp. 181), from the same point of view.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Moullé, *Les Corporations Drapières de la Flandre au Moyen-Age*, I. (Revue des Questions Historiques, July); A. Eekhof, *Twee Documenten betreffende den Slavenhandel in de 17^e Eeuw* (Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis, XI. 3); L. de Torre, *Los Motines Militares en Flandes*, I. (Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas, y Museos, May, July).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

The Autobiography of Charlotte Amélie, Princess of Aldenburg, translated by Mrs. Aubrey Le Blond (New York, McBride, Nast, and Company), the memoirs of a princess of the House of Trémoille, lady in waiting to the Queen of Denmark and wife to the king's brother, gives a useful picture of the customs of the period.

James Mavor, professor of political economy in the University of Toronto, has recently issued *An Economic History of Russia* (New York, Dutton, 1914, pp. xxxii, 614, xxii, 630). The first volume treats mainly of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the second of the revolutionary movements. The history of the Jews in Russia and their endeavors to improve their character and status are recounted in *The Haskalah Movement in Russia* (Philadelphia, the Jewish Publications Society of America, 1913, pp. 355) by Dr. J. S. Raisin.

E. A. Brayley Hodgetts is the author of *The Life of Catherine the Great of Russia* (Brentano), which attempts to treat Catherine chiefly from the point of view of her value to Russia. The author has achieved a fair-minded and detailed picture, using diplomatic papers and personal letters extensively.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. Waliszewski, *Alexandre I^{er} Diplomate* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXVIII. 3); E. Daniels, *Russische Finanzen unter Alexander II. und der Ursprung des Türkenkrieges von 1877* (Preussische Jahrbücher, August); M. Kovalevsky, *La Contre-Révolution en Russie* (Revue Politique Internationale, July, August); J. Dräseke, *Kaiser Kantakuzenos' Geschichtswerk* (Neue Jahrbücher, XXXIII. 7); F. van Langenhove, *La Nationalité Albanaise* (Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles, February, March, June).

THE FAR EAST AND INDIA

The Archaeological Institute of America proposes to undertake the institution of an American School of Archaeology in Pekin. Preliminary inquiries and investigations in China, Indo-China, Manchuria, Mongolia, and Russia have been made by Mr. Langdon Warner, the director.

In *Japanese Government Documents, 1867-1889*, issued by the Asiatic Society of Japan (Tokyo, 1914, pp. 681) English translations are presented of all the essential documents—laws, constitutions, ordinances, rescripts—for the history of the transition from the feudal to the modern and representative régime.

The Arthur H. Clark Company has published a volume by Professor F. A. Golder, of the Washington State Agricultural College, on *Russian Expansion on the Pacific, 1641-1850*, an account of Russian expeditions along the Pacific Coast of Asia and North America, and to the Arctic regions.

In *The Gods of Northern Buddhism*, a sumptuous volume published by the Oxford University Press (pp. 246), Professor A. Getty presents an account of the history and progressive evolution of these deities throughout the northern Buddhist countries, and especially of their iconography.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. W. Rockhill, *Notes on the Relations and Trade of China with the Eastern Archipelago and the Coast of the Indian Ocean during the Fourteenth Century*, I. (T'oung Pao, XV.); M. von Brandt, *Zur Geschichte der Chinesischen Revolution*, II. (Deutsche Rundschau, September).

AMERICA

GENERAL ITEMS

The work on the Atlas of the Historical Geography of the United States which is being prepared by the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington has profited much by the aid of Professor R. H. Whitbeck of the University of Wisconsin, who has been associated with it for the period extending from October 1 to February 1. Professor Golder has finished his work for the Department in the archives of Moscow as well as those of Petrograd, and is now on his way home.

The Naval History Society held its annual meeting in Washington on December 17. Rear-admiral Caspar F. Goodrich was elected president. The society has issued for 1914 the second volume of *Out-Letters of the Marine Committee*, ed. C. O. Paullin, and will soon have ready its books of Gustavus Conyngham and of Admiral Graves, the latter to be reinforced from the recently discovered papers of de Grasse. A book of naval songs and ballads is also in contemplation.

Teachers in secondary schools will find Dr. John Wayland's *How to Teach American History* (Macmillan), a storehouse of practical suggestions, useful bibliographies, and stimulating criticisms. With the concrete guides and lesson-plans of the usual manual for normal schools, the author has combined suggestive chapters on the philosophy which must underlie the teacher's work.

The *Magazine of History* for April, and the double issue for May-June, contain further installments of the late Colonel Legrand B. Cannon's "Personal Reminiscences of the Rebellion", and an interesting sketch in five parts by Professor Arthur K. Davis, entitled "Three Centuries of an Old Virginia Town (Petersburg)". We note especially, in the May-June number, an article by Charles W. Holmes comparing the British and American Cabinets and a somewhat important contribution by Edward E. Curtis entitled "The Provisioning of the British Troops in Boston, 1776". Among the documents are letters of Colonel Robert Gould Shaw, 1861, and single letters of Major Benjamin Church, 1696;

Washington, 1776; Martha Washington, 1793; Alexander Hamilton, 1800; Charles Pettit, 1780; Admiral Farragut, 1864; and General A. G. Draper, 1869.

Professor Edward A. Ross's *The Old World in the New: the Significance of Past and Present Immigration to the American People* (New York, Century Company, 1914, pp. 327) presents in collected form the author's articles in the *Century Magazine*, in which the amount and quality of the various elements in immigration to the United States are intelligently presented, with some data respecting the history of the movement.

Thomas Burgess has published a volume on the *Greeks in America* (Boston, Sherman, French, and Company, 1913, pp. xiv, 256) giving an account of their coming, progress, customs, living, and aspirations, with an historical introduction and the stories of some of the famous American Greeks.

Jewish Immigration to the United States from 1881 to 1910 (Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law), by Samuel Joseph, is an examination of the causes of Jewish immigration and the most important social qualities of the immigrants.

The American Jewish Historical Society has signalized the completion of twenty years of publishing activity since its foundation in 1892, by bringing out an analytical index to the first twenty volumes of its publications. This *Index to the Publications* (the society, 1914, pp. viii, 600) is prepared in an admirable manner and furnishes a most complete guide to this valuable series. Appended is an index to the articles in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* relating to the history of the Jews in the United States.

The greater part of the *Records* of the American Catholic Historical Society for June is devoted to a controversy over "The Air of the 'Star Spangled Banner'". In the same number as well as in the September issue, are further chapters of Griffin's "Life of Bishop Conwell, revised and edited by the Rev. Lemuel B. Morton". The latter number also contains an article by Robert J. J. Haskins on "The First Three Catholic Churches in Zanesville, Ohio", and extracts from the baptismal records of St. Mary's Church, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, 1795-1800.

Volume VII. (June, 1914) of the United States Catholic Historical Society's *Historical Records and Studies* includes the Sulpicians in the United States, by Dr. Charles G. Herbermann, Le Moyne D'Iberville, by Rev. Thomas J. Campbell, Pierre D'Ailly and the Discovery of America, by Canon Louis Salembier of the Catholic University of Lille, and Fra Junípero Serra and the California Missions, by Ann Judge.

An Economic Analysis of the Constitutional Restrictions upon Public Indebtedness in the United States (*Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin*, no. 637), by Dr. Horace Secrist, treats certain aspects of the sub-

ject historically. There is, for instance, a chapter upon the general environment which produced the constitutional restrictions upon state indebtedness, another upon the immediate causes, and a third upon the origin, of the constitutional restrictions upon municipal indebtedness.

ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

The American-Scandinavian Foundation has just issued, in a projected series of Scandinavian monographs, volume I. of *The Voyages of the Norsemen to America*, by William Hovgaard, late commander in the royal Danish navy, now professor in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. While the whole problem of the voyages is investigated, their nautical aspects receive the most extensive treatment. Those parts of the Icelandic sagas that pertain to Vinland are given in translation.

S. de Ispizua has undertaken to assemble the available information on an obscure phase of the period of discovery in *Historia de los Vascos en el Descubrimiento, Conquista, y Civilización de América* (vol. I., Bilbao, Lerchundi Ledesma, 1914, pp. ix, 274).

The Hispanic Society of America has brought out *Willem Janszoon Blaeu, 1571-1638: a Sketch of his Life and Work, with special Reference to his large World Map of 1605*, by Professor E. L. Stevenson.

Mr. Artemas Ward of New York City has added to the collections in the Artemas Ward Homestead at Shrewsbury, Massachusetts, a full-size photoprint facsimile of the orderly-book of General Artemas Ward. The orderly-book extends from April 20, 1775, to March 20, 1777, and is followed by General Ward's letter-book, extending from April 7, 1776, to April 3, 1777.

The Yale University Press has recently published a revised edition of the *Life of Nathan Hale* by Professor Henry P. Johnston of the College of the City of New York. The first edition was published in 1901.

For this academic year, the Albert Shaw Lectures in American Diplomatic History at the Johns Hopkins University were given in November by Professor Clarence W. Alvord, the subject being the Partition of the West in 1783.

Professor Archer B. Hulbert has brought out through the Arthur H. Clark Company *Washington and the West: being George Washington's Diary of September, 1784; and a Commentary upon the same*.

The fourth volume of the *Writings of John Quincy Adams*, edited by Worthington C. Ford, has come from the press (Macmillan). The volume covers the years 1811-1813, when Mr. Adams was at St. Petersburg.

The Burton Historical Collection of the Detroit Public Library has come into possession of the orderly-books of Colonel Isaac Shelby, covering the period of the Detroit campaign in the War of 1812 under General Harrison.

The Neale Publishing Company has brought out *The Political and Economic Doctrines of John Marshall . . . and also his Letters, Speeches, and hitherto unpublished and uncollected Writings*, edited by J. E. Oster.

Mr. D. W. Howe, president of the Indiana Historical Society, has brought out through Messrs. Putnam a volume entitled *Political History of Secession to the Beginning of the American Civil War*.

The letter-press copy book of the correspondence of General W. T. Sherman during the two years prior to the Civil War, when he was in charge of the State Military Seminary of Louisiana, has been presented to the State Historical Society of Wisconsin by W. B. Carter of Lancaster.

Lieut.-Col. John Page Nicholson of Philadelphia has prepared and published in a volume of 1022 pages a catalogue of his collection of materials relating to the Civil War. The collection includes manuscripts and excerpts as well as books.

The True Ulysses S. Grant, by General Charles King, is the latest addition to Messrs. Lippincott's "True" series.

Dr. Annie Heloise Abel, professor of history in Goucher College, has completed her work on *The American Indian as Slaveholder and Secessionist: an Omitted Chapter in the Diplomatic History of the Southern Confederacy*. The book will be published soon. Miss Abel has edited for the United States Indian Office the official correspondence of James S. Calhoun, first territorial governor of New Mexico.

John Hay: Author and Statesman, by Professor Lorenzo Sears, has been published by Dodd, Mead, and Company.

Hon. Samuel W. McCall has written a *Life of Thomas B. Reed*, just published by the Houghton Mifflin Company.

LOCAL ITEMS, ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

Little, Brown, and Company have brought out *Social Life in Old New England*, by Mary Caroline Crawford.

The Maine Historical Society has brought out four additional volumes of the *Documentary History of Maine* (XVII. to XX.), continuing the collection called the Baxter manuscripts, edited by James Phinney Baxter.

Dr. Henry S. Burrage, who was in England at the outbreak of the present European war, gathered for the Maine Historical Society an interesting collection of the posters used in connection with enlistments, etc., including the proclamations calling for troops and the war posters used by the city of Oxford.

The *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society at its semi-annual meeting of April, 1914 (pp. 215), is occupied to the extent of nearly five-sixths by a body of quite general Notes on the Calendar and the Almanac, by Mr. George E. Littlefield; and by a check-list of Con-

necticut Almanacs, 1709-1850, prepared by Mr. Albert C. Bates, secretary of the Connecticut Historical Society, with a suitable introduction and notes. The remaining pages contain an account of the early migrations of the Indians in New England and the Maritime Provinces, by Mr. R. B. Dixon, and a well-informed and clearly presented defense of Poinsett's career in Mexico, by Dr. Justin H. Smith.

The October serial of the *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society contains some papers, 1636-1644, of William Pynchon of Springfield, and a paper by Mr. Jonathan Smith on Toryism in Worcester County.

In the *Essex Institute Historical Collections* for October, the publication of Benjamin F. Browne's "Youthful Recollections of Salem", written in 1867, is continued, as are also the extracts from the probate records of Essex County, Massachusetts.

Rhode Island Imprints, 1727-1800, a collection of 1560 entries of books, pamphlets, newspapers, etc., printed in the colony and state during the eighteenth century, together with a number of facsimiles, is printed by the Rhode Island Historical Society for its members. The compiler is Mr. George Parker Winship, who also writes an introduction.

The report of the librarian of the Rhode Island Historical Society, in the society's *Proceedings* for 1913-1914, notes among the accessions of the year a series of the *Newport Mercury* for 1774 and 1775 and a number of other early newspapers, the excessively rare *Calendrier Français*, printed at Newport in 1781 on the press of the French fleet, temporarily set up on shore, an extra-illustrated edition of Mason's *Newport*, comprising over 500 valuable documents, the gift of Mr. Oliver Hazard Perry, and the commissions and correspondence of Commodore Silas Talbot, consisting of about fifty manuscripts, including besides Talbot's official correspondence numerous letters from prominent persons to him. The manuscripts preserved in the society's vault have been catalogued, and the librarian has begun a check-list of eighteenth-century Rhode Island newspapers.

The *Annual Report* of the Connecticut Historical Society (May, 1914) includes a rough list of the Johnson family papers recently donated to the society. The more important of these are the papers of William Samuel Johnson, including nearly 500 letters written by him, about 200 letters written to him, and a series of letter-books extending from 1746 to 1774. There are numerous family papers of a miscellaneous sort. The society has received as a gift from Mr. James H. Goodwin 670 numbers of the *Connecticut Journal*, scattered through the period 1777-1821. It has also come into possession of the autograph collection of the late Edgar T. Welles, son of Gideon Welles, secretary of the navy in Lincoln's cabinet. The collection comprises about 2400 letters, principally of the period 1810-1860, many of them from men prominent in public and political life.

The Colonial History of Hartford, by Rev. W. De L. Love, is drawn from original records (Hartford, the author).

The fourteenth annual meeting of the New York State Historical Association, held at Saratoga Springs, Bennington, and Schuylerville September 17 to 20, 1912, was devoted to the several phases of the Burgoyne campaign. The numerous papers and addresses, as also some account of the sessions and other exercises, are brought out in volume XII. of the society's *Proceedings*. The principal of these papers are: Relation of the Battle of Bennington to the Battle of Saratoga, by Rev. Isaac Jennings; the Place of Saratoga in the Revolutionary War, by General A. S. Draper; General Schuyler's Part in the Burgoyne Campaign, by F. W. Halsey; General Daniel Morgan's Part in the Burgoyne Campaign, by Rev. J. H. Brandow; St. Leger's Invasion and the Battle of Oriskany, by F. H. Allen; and the Influence of the Death of Jane McCrea on the Burgoyne Campaign, by J. A. Holden. There is also a scholarly paper on Burgoyne by Rev. Henry Belcher, author of the *First Civil War in America*.

The sixteenth annual meeting of the same association was held in Utica, October 5 to 8. Among the addresses delivered the following may be mentioned: Notes on the Early History of the Palatines in the Valley, by Rev. W. W. Ellsworth; the Battle of Oriskany, by H. J. Cookinham; Early Institutions of Learning in the Mohawk Valley, by President Charles A. Richmond of Union College; the History of Transportation in the Mohawk Valley, by Lieutenant William G. Mayer; Samuel Kirkland and the Oneida Indians, by Rev. M. W. Stryker; and French Immigrants of the Black River Country, by W. A. Moore.

The *New York Genealogical and Biographical Record* for July contains an account, by John Cox, jr., of the Quaker records in New York, together with a list of meetings and a map of 1821 showing the "Meetings constituting New York Yearly Meeting of Friends".

The *Acts and Proceedings* of the Pennsylvania Federation of Historical Societies, ninth annual meeting, Harrisburg, January 15, 1914 (pp. 111), has been issued. Especially deserving attention are the report of the committee on the preservation of manuscript records and that of the committee on state legislation.

Among the recent acquisitions of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania are the following: a collection of Penn material, comprising William Penn's journals in Ireland, Holland, and Germany, documents relating to Pennsylvania affairs, and a number of letters of William Penn and others of the Penn family; the diary of Thomas F. Pleasants, 1814-1817, covering life at Camp DuPont; an addition to the Cox-Parrish-Wharton papers, including 152 manuscripts and nine maps, presented by Mrs. Rodman Wharton; an addition of 24 manuscripts to the Lincoln collection, from the estates of Louis C. Vanuxem and William Potter; fifty-nine maps and other materials, presented by Miss Letitia A. Humphreys

as an addition to the Humphreys collection; an addition of 217 letters and documents to the Dreer collection; and 119 miscellaneous newspapers published at Poughkeepsie, 1796-1825.

In the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* for October Dr. John W. Jordan prints the Journal of John Watson, assistant surveyor to the commissioners of the province of Pennsylvania, 1750. Among the articles in the same issue is "The Pennsylvania and Virginia Boundary Controversy" by John L. Potter.

The Pennsylvania-German in the Settlement of Maryland, by D. W. Nead, illustrated by Julius F. Sachse, is part XXV. of the series of monographs prepared by authority of the Pennsylvania-German Society, having for the general title *Pennsylvania: the German Influence in its Settlement and Development*.

A new issue of the Rev. Jehu C. Clay's *Annals of the Swedes on the Delaware* (1835, 1858), has been brought out in handy form, but without substantial revision in the light of Dr. Amandus Johnson's researches, by the Swedish Historical Society of America (Chicago, the society, 1914, pp. 170).

The Maryland Historical Society has issued, for the state of Maryland, vol. XXXIV. of the *Maryland Archives*, embracing the proceedings and acts of the General Assembly from October, 1720, to October, 1723, five sessions.

Under the caption of "Some Old English Letters", the *Maryland Historical Magazine* for June prints a group of personal letters of 1724-1746, written by Mrs. Helen Wolseley Sprat, widow of the Bishop of Rochester, Mrs. Elizabeth Arnold Duncombe, Margaret Calvert, Bryan Fairfax, and Mrs. Alicia Arnold Ross. The letters are elaborately annotated by McHenry Howard. There are also printed a few documents on the Bank Riot of 1835, and further installments of the Vestry Proceedings of St. Ann's Parish, Annapolis; and of Land Notes, 1634-1635.

The Colonial Trade of Maryland, 1689-1715, by Miss Margaret Morriss, is a recent number of the *Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science*.

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* for October contains the conclusion of the "Randolph Manuscript", continuations of the Council Papers (March-May, 1702), and of the Sainsbury Abstracts and De Jarnette Papers (October, 1677); and a group of eight letters from Richard Adams to Thomas Adams, 1771-1778.

The *Bulletin* of the Virginia State Library, vol. VII., nos. 2 and 3, consists of a list of maps relating to Virginia in the Virginia State Library and other departments of the commonwealth, together with the Virginia maps contained in seventeenth-century and eighteenth-century atlases possessed by the Library of Congress. Compiled by Mr. Earl G. Swem, and furnished with learned annotations, the pamphlet (pp. 37-263) forms a valuable work of historical reference.

The principal contribution in the *William and Mary College Quarterly* for October, is a study of "Morgan and his Riflemen", by Lieut. W. W. Edwards. Among the documents, apart from continuations, should be noted a "List of taxable articles . . . in Williamsburg . . . 1783".

The state of North Carolina has now brought out the fourth and concluding volume of Dr. Stephen B. Weeks's *Index to the Colonial and State Records of North Carolina*. Besides indexing with care the 26 volumes of the series, Dr. Weeks presents in his final volume an elaborate and authoritative "Historical Review of the Colonial and State Records of North Carolina", dealing with the history of this extensive publication and the character of its contents, and also furnishing a most useful description of the manuscript sources for the history of North Carolina in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in archives and libraries, domestic and foreign.

The *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* for July prints six letters of Peter Manigault written from London in 1750 and 1752, and the first installment of the parish register of St. James, Santee, 1758-1788.

The Tennessee Historical Society expects to issue this winter the first number of a *Tennessee Historical Magazine*, edited by Professor St. George L. Sioussat of Vanderbilt University.

The Ohio Valley Historical Association held its eighth annual meeting in Charleston, West Virginia, November 27 and 28. Some of the noteworthy papers presented at the meeting were the following: John Floyd and Oregon, by Professor C. H. Ambler; the Tories at Fort Pitt and what became of them, by Professor W. H. Siebert; General Wilkinson's First Break with the Spaniards, by Professor I. J. Cox; Early Land Grants in Southeastern Ohio, by Professor H. W. Elson; West Virginians v. West Virginia, 1861-1863, by Professor J. C. McGregor; and a series of papers on the development of transportation in Ohio.

The second number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, being the issue for September, marks in our judgment a distinct advance upon the first. Professor M. M. Quaife's paper called "Critical Evaluation of the Sources of Western History" examines once more the question of Jonathan Carver, but consists mainly in a dissection of George W. Ogden's *Letters from the West* (New Bedford, 1823), which is conclusively shown to be valueless. Of more importance are the articles of Professor W. H. Siebert on the Dispersion of the American Tories, that of Professor W. O. Scruggs on William Walker's Designs on Cuba, and that of Professor I. J. Cox on the Pan-American Policy of Jefferson and Wilkinson. Mr. D. E. Clark of the State Historical Society of Iowa surveys the historical activities of the last two years in the trans-Mississippi Northwest and in Western Canada. There are notes on Dr. Daniel Coxe's Carolana, on John Peter Salling's journey in the Mississippi Valley about 1738-1742,

on an additional petition of 1780 for a western state; also a diary of a scout who participated in the campaign for the relief of Detroit and Fort Wayne in August and September, 1812. Some forty books, of western history, of other American history, and of political science, are reviewed.

The *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* for October is devoted to the proceedings of the twenty-ninth annual meeting of the State Archaeological and Historical Society, and to the dedication in Columbus, on May 30, of the society's museum and library building.

The *Quarterly Publication of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio* for July-September contains the second installment of selections from the Follett Papers. The letters here printed are principally from Thomas Corwin to Oran Follett, and are of the years 1842-1851. Their principal interest lies in their bearing upon the history of the Whig party.

The *Indiana Magazine of History* contains an historical survey by Professor James A. Woodburn of Constitution Making in Indiana. Other articles are Jackson County prior to 1850, by John C. Lazenby, Indiana History in the Public Schools, by Oscar H. Williams, and the concluding part of Home Life in Early Indiana, by William F. Vogel.

The Indiana Centennial Celebration Committee has issued *Suggestive Plans for a Historical and Educational Celebration in Indiana, 1916*. The book is attractively illustrated.

Among the contents of the January and July numbers of the Illinois State Historical Society's *Journal*, we note the following: Marking the Site of Old Fort St. Joseph, by M. M. Quaife; The Great Cahokia Mound, by J. F. Snyder; The Early Courts of Chicago and Cook County, by Orrin N. Carter; New Jersey Families in Illinois, by Edmund J. James; and Soldiers of the American Revolution buried in Illinois, by Mrs. Edwin S. Walker.

The *Transactions* of the Illinois State Historical Society for the year 1912 (*Publications* of the Illinois State Historical Library, no. 17) includes the papers read at the thirteenth annual meeting of the society in May of that year. Noteworthy among these are: the West and the War with Mexico, by W. E. Dodd; the Calumet Portage, by W. H. Lee; Genesis of the Whig Party in Illinois, by C. M. Thompson; Was there a French Fort at Chicago? by M. M. Quaife; Virginia Currency in the Illinois Country, by Mrs. Minnie G. Cook; and Senator Stephen A. Douglas and the Germans in 1854, by F. I. Herriott. Mr. W. D. Barge contributes a useful list of the old towns in Illinois, with their corresponding new names. Publication no. 18 of the library is *A List of the Genealogical Works in the Illinois State Historical Library*, compiled by Georgia L. Osborne.

The Development of Banking in Illinois, 1817-1863 (*University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences*, vol. II., no. 4), by Dr. George

William Dowrie, is a valuable contribution to the financial history of the United States. An interesting feature of the study is concerned with the relation between banking and internal improvements in Illinois.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has recently acquired, from the governor's office, all the papers therein preserved pertaining to the Civil War, numbering some 15,000 in all; a collection, numbering probably more than 40,000, of personal papers of the late Judge E. W. Keyes of Madison, covering the period from 1851 to 1910; and a small but interesting collection of correspondence between Edwin Bottomley, an early settler, and his father in England. The annual address before the society, October 22, was delivered by Mr. Worthington C. Ford, of the Massachusetts Historical Society, on the subject of The Treaty of Ghent—and After. Besides the annual volume of *Proceedings* the society expects to issue soon the first volume of its *Calendar of the Draper Manuscripts*.

At a meeting of the executive council of the Minnesota Historical Society on November 10 Dr. Warren Upham, formerly secretary and librarian of the society, was elected archaeologist, and Dr. Solon J. Buck was elected superintendent and secretary. The society has recently acquired by gift from the library of Hon. Ignatius Donnelly a collection of letters, scrapbooks, pamphlets, etc., comprising about 30,000 items and relating principally to the history of Minnesota.

The State Historical Society of Iowa has published a *History of Township Government in Iowa*, by Dr. C. R. Aurner, which will later be followed by a *History of County Government in Iowa*, by Dr. F. H. Garver; also by a history of *Third Party Movements in Iowa*, by Professor F. E. Haynes. The society has also brought out volumes I. and II. of Mr. Aurner's *History of Education in Iowa*, which is to run to six volumes. Of the *Iowa Applied History* series, vol. II. is in press, reprints of the separate papers having already been issued, such as *Reorganization of State Government in Iowa*, by F. E. Horack, *Home Rule in Iowa*, by O. K. Patton, and *Direct Legislation in Iowa*, by Jacob Van der Zee. Of the *Iowa Social History* series, the latest project of the society, two volumes will be ready for distribution in the near future. They are: a *History of Social Legislation in Iowa*, by John E. Briggs, and a *History of Poor Relief Legislation in Iowa*, by John L. Gillin.

The October *Annals of Iowa* contains biographical sketches of Judge George G. Wright, John I. Blair, and Charles Abiathar White. There are also printed a war-time diary (May 15–July, 1864) of Dr. W. I. Nicholson, surgeon in the 29th Iowa Infantry, and a bibliographical contribution by Alice Marple, "Iowa Authors and their Work".

The principal contribution in the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* for October is a careful study by Jacob Van der Zee of "Fur Trade Operations in the Eastern Iowa Country from 1800 to 1833". There is

also a suggestive article by Louis Pelzer on "The Public Domain as a Field for Historical Study".

A *History of Butler County, Iowa*, in two volumes, by I. H. Hart, and a *History of Franklin County, Iowa*, likewise in two volumes, edited by I. L. Stuart, are recent outputs of the S. J. Clarke Publishing Company.

The *Missouri Historical Review* for July presents Major Alphonso Wetmore's Diary of a Journey to Santa Fé, in 1828, edited by F. F. Stephens. The October number contains a study entitled "A Sketch of Missouri Constitutional History during the Territorial Period", by Floyd C. Shoemaker; and the translation of an account by Edward Zimmerman, a German immigrant, of a foot-tour in Missouri in 1838.

The Loan Office Experiment in Missouri, 1821-1836, by A. J. McCulloch, is issued as vol. XV., no. 24, of the *University of Missouri Bulletin*.

The *Fourth Biennial Report* of the board of curators of the Louisiana State Museum includes lists of the accessions to the department of history. Noteworthy are the Vidal papers and correspondence, 1787-1808, and papers of William Kenner and Company. The most important accession was the manuscripts, documents, etc., some ten thousand in number, dating from 1728 to 1803, deposited by the Louisiana Historical Society.

Aside from continuations, the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* for October contains an article on Harris County, Texas, 1822-1845, by Adele B. Looscan, and a letter from A. M. Manigault, written at Vera Cruz in 1847. The continuations consist of R. G. Cleland's Early Sentiment for the Annexation of California, Miss Sandbo's First Session of the Secession Convention in Texas, and British Correspondence concerning Texas, contributed by Professor E. D. Adams.

Mr. E. W. Winkler of the Texas State Library has brought out the *Diary of Ephraim Shelby Dodd*, December 4, 1862, to January 1, 1864 (Austin, E. L. Steck, pp. 32). Dodd was a member of Company D, Terry's Texas Rangers, and was hanged at Knoxville, Tennessee, as a spy, on the evidence of this diary.

T. Turnbull's Travels from the United States across the Plains to California, edited with introduction and notes by Professor Frederic L. Paxson, is issued as *Separate no. 158* from the *Proceedings* of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin for 1913 (pp. 151-225). Turnbull's journey west of the Missouri was by the Mormon Trail instead of the Oregon Trail, which was usually followed in 1852 by gold-seekers, and his journal is one of the few records of travel by that route.

The *Washington Historical Quarterly* for October prints an article by Professor F. J. Turner on "The West and American Ideals", and continues the publication of the Journal of John Work and of "A New Vancouver Journal", as well as of a syllabus of Northwestern history.

In its *Quarterly* for March, the Oregon Historical Society prints the annual address delivered before it by Judge William C. Brown: Old Fort Okanogan and the Okanogan Trail. The Journal of David Thompson, July 3-15, 1811, copied from the Ontario Archives, is printed with introduction and notes by T. C. Elliott.

California: an Intimate History, by Mrs. Gertrude Atherton, has been issued by Harper and Brothers.

Junípero Serra: the Man and his Work, by A. H. Fitch, is a popular account of the life of the Franciscan monk and pioneer (McClurg).

San Diego and Imperial Counties, California: a Record of Settlement, Organization, Progress, and Achievement (two volumes), edited by S. T. Black, is from the press of S. J. Clarke.

A revised edition of Professor Dean C. Worcester's *The Philippines Past and Present* contains a new chapter of nearly fifty pages reviewing "One Year of the New Era".

Dr. George Bryce has rewritten his *Short History of the Canadian People*, bringing the work up to date (Scribner).

Volume III. of Lescarbot's *History of New France*, edited by Professor W. L. Grant, has been issued by the Champlain Society.

Judge A. W. Savary has brought out a volume of 142 pages supplementary to Calnek's *History of the County of Annapolis, including Old Port Royal and Acadia*, edited and extended by him some years ago. The supplement corrects and enlarges the more important features of the older work and includes an account of the Scottish attempt at colonization under Sir William Alexander (1623-1632), and also of that under D'Aulnay de Charnisay, the first governor (1636-1651), besides much material concerning the Loyalist settlers.

The Fall of Canada: a Chapter in the History of the Seven Years' War, by Professor George M. Wrong of the University of Toronto, deals in detail with the events of a single year of the war, from Wolfe's victory before Quebec, in September, 1759, to the surrender of Canada in September, 1760 (Oxford, Clarendon Press).

We have received at the same time two pamphlets respecting the Rush-Bagot agreement and the history of action under it. The one, appearing in the pamphlet series of the World Peace Foundation, is *The Anglo-American Agreement of 1817 for Disarmament on the Great Lakes* (Boston, pp. 28) by Dr. Charles H. Levermore; the other, a publication of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, entitled *Limitation of Armament on the Great Lakes* (Washington, pp. 57), is a reprint of a report made to President Harrison in 1892 by John W. Foster, secretary of state, and originally printed as 52 Cong., 2 sess., *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 9*.

The September issue of the *Revue Canadienne*, of Montreal, contains seven articles relating to Sir Georges-Étienne Cartier, the ministerial colleague of Sir John A. Macdonald, in commemoration of the centenary of his birth on September 6.

A brief sketch of *The Grange in Canada*, by H. Michel, is *Bulletin* no. 13 of the departments of history and political and economic science in Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada.

It is announced that Morang and Company of Toronto will issue a *Life of Lord Strathcona*, by Dr. John Macnaughton, of McGill University.

No. 9 of the *Canadian Archive Publications* is *The Canadian Northwest, its Early Development and Legislative Records*, vol. I., text by Professor E. H. Oliver, documents from the Minutes of the Red River Colony and the Northern Department of Rupert's Land, and six folded maps.

British Columbia from the Earliest Times to the Present, in four volumes, by E. O. S. Scholefield and F. W. Howay, comes from the press of S. J. Clarke.

Messrs. Putnam have issued *Mexican Archaeology: an Introduction to the Archaeology of the Mexican and Mayan Civilizations of Pre-Spanish America*, by T. A. Joyce.

M. Cuevas, of the Society of Jesus, has collected and annotated a volume of *Documentos Inéditos del Siglo XVI. para la Historia de México* (Mexico, Museo Nacional, 1914, pp. xxxi, 521). The first three books are included in the first volume of F. Cervantes de Salazar, *Crónica de Nueva España* (Madrid, Hausser and Menet, 1914, pp. lvi, 363), published in *Papeles de Nueva España*, compiled and published by Francisco del Paso y Troncoso.

Despite the lessening interest in the Mexican problem, due to European war, the output of books on Mexico has not altogether ceased. *A Popular History of Mexico*, by Hubert Howe Bancroft, is a book of 1887 by this veteran historian, brought down to date by the addition of a score of pages recounting the story of the present revolution (New York, The Bancroft Company, pp. 581).

Insurgent Mexico (Appleton), by John Reed, is a series of pen pictures of personal experiences and events among the revolutionists of Mexico, written by a newspaper correspondent. Phases of life both in the little armies and among the peons are set forth graphically and often humorously, and one gets some notion of the conglomerate of ideas and feelings underlying the revolution—and of Villa. At times, however, this rapid succession of moving pictures might be clearer to the understanding if more of explanatory legend were thrown upon the screen.

The Cuban *Boletín del Archivo Nacional* prints in the July-August number a group of letters from the correspondence of the intendant-

general of hacienda of Cuba with the Spanish government, July to October, 1747.

Smith and Elder have published in London, in two volumes, *The Spanish Dependencies in South America, an Introduction to the History of their Civilization*, by Professor Bernard Moses, formerly of the University of California.

Under the title *The Evolution of Brazil compared with that of Spanish and Anglo-Saxon America*, the Leland Stanford Junior University has brought out (*Publications, University Series*) a group of six lectures delivered at the university in the autumn of 1912 by Dr. Manoel de Oliveira Lima, sometime attaché of the Brazilian embassy in Washington, and author of numerous writings on Brazilian history. Professor P. A. Martin of the university furnishes an appreciative introduction and numerous explanatory notes.

The Uruguayan war for independence is the main subject of *Artigas y la Revolución Americana* (Paris, Ollendorff, 1914, pp. vii, 404) by H. D. Barbagelata.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. R. Swanton and R. B. Dixon, *Primitive American History* (*American Anthropologist*, July–September); Mrs. L. K. Mathews, *Benjamin Franklin's Plans for a Colonial Union, 1750–1775* (*American Political Science Review*, August); F. A. Woods, *The Racial Origin of Successful Americans* (*Popular Science Monthly*, April); M. Serrano y Sanz, *El Brigadier Jaime Wilkinson y sus Tratos con España para la Independencia del Kentucky, Años 1787 à 1797*, II., III. (*Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas, y Museos*, May, July); G. Latorre, *La Separación del Virreinato de Nueva España de la Metrópoli*, I. (*ibid.*, July); Roscoe Pound, *The Place of Judge Story in the Making of American Law* (*American Law Review*, September–October); H. C. Washburn, *The Battle of Lake Champlain* (*U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, September–October); L. N. Feipel, *The Wilkes Exploring Expedition* (*ibid.*); B. B. Kendrick, *Toombs and Stephens* (*Political Science Quarterly*, September); W. R. Thayer, *Lincoln and some Union Generals, from Unpublished Diaries of John Hay* (*Harper's Monthly*, December); A. R. H. Ransom, *Reminiscences of the Civil War* (*Sewanee Review*, November); Lieutenant W. J. Büttgenbach, *Coast Defense in the Civil War: Fort Sumter* (*Journal of the United States Artillery Association*, September–October); C. R. Fish, *Carl Schurz* (*Political Science Quarterly*, September); G. A. Wood, *The Black Code of Alabama* (*South Atlantic Quarterly*, October); R. de Manjarrés, *Proyectos Españoles de Canal Interoceánico* (*Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas, y Museos*, January, March); G. Deschamps, *Jacques de Liniers, Libérateur de Buenos Aires* (*Revue Sud-Américaine*, July); A. L. Pereyra and L. de la Robla, *L'État des Provinces du Rio de la Plata en 1824 d'après les Envoyés du Gouvernement d'Espagne* (*ibid.*).

LIST OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS IN HISTORY NOW IN PROGRESS AT THE CHIEF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES, DECEMBER, 1914

[In 1897 the compiler of this list began the practice of collecting, from professors of American history having charge of candidates for the doctor's degree, lists of the subjects of their dissertations. These were then circulated among the professors, in typewritten form, to avoid duplication and for other purposes. Subsequently the list was enlarged to include all subjects, and not solely the American. In 1902 the practice began of printing the lists. That for December, 1909, was accompanied by a list of those historical dissertations which had been printed. The list for December, 1912, was printed in the *History Teacher's Magazine* for January, 1913; that for December, 1913, in this journal (XIX. 450-465). Henceforward, it may be expected that such lists will appear annually in the January number of this journal. Copies of the printed lists for the years 1909-1913 can still be supplied by the compiler, J. F. Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.]

GENERAL

- E. P. Smith, A.B. Women's College of Baltimore 1904; A.M. Columbia 1909. History of the Opposition to the Theory of Evolution. *Columbia*.

ANCIENT HISTORY

- S. G. Dunseath, A.B. Ursinus 1910; A.M. Columbia 1911. An Economic Interpretation of Hebrew History from the Egyptian Bondage to the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. *Columbia*.
- George Dahl, A.B. Yale 1908, A.M. 1909. The History of the City of Dor, Syria. *Yale*.
- W. B. Fleming, A.B. Muskingum 1894, A.M. 1897; B.D. Drew 1897. History of the City of Tyre. *Columbia*.
- Carl Huth, A.B. Wisconsin 1904, A.M. 1905. Rights and Customs of Sanctuary in Ancient Greece and Rome. *Columbia*.
- E. J. Jennings, A.B. St. Stephens College 1912. Some Aspects of Greek Society in the Seventh and Sixth Centuries. *Columbia*.
- Oric Bates, A.B. Harvard 1905. The History of Cyrene. *Harvard*.
- C. W. Blegen, A.B. Minnesota 1907; A.B. Yale 1908. Studies in the History of Ancient Corinth. *Yale*.
- Herbert Wing, jr., A.B. Harvard 1909; A.M. Wisconsin 1911. The Financial Relations of Athens and her Allies in the Fifth Century. *Wisconsin*.
- H. G. Teel, A.B. Dickinson 1911, A.M. 1912. Athenian Social Conditions represented in the Orations of Lysias. *Columbia*.
- R. V. Cram, A.B. Harvard 1907, A.M. 1908. Studies in the History of Attic Demes. *Harvard*.
- E. C. Hunsden, A.B. Columbia 1908. History of the Delphic Amphictyony. *Columbia*.

- H. P. Arnold, A.B. Harvard 1906, A.M. 1907. Chronology of Delos, 314-166 B. C. *Harvard*.
- A. D. Muir, A.B. McGill 1912. Ptolemy Philadelphus. *Harvard*.
- F. W. Clark, A.B. Manitoba 1892; Ph.D. Chicago 1913. A Consideration of the Influence of Sea-Power upon the History of the Roman Republic. *Chicago*.
- S. P. R. Chadwick, A.B. Harvard 1892, A.M. 1899. The Conditions of Italian Colonization during the Government of the Roman Senate. *Harvard*.
- R. N. Blews, A.B. Greenville 1904. The Lex Julia Municipalis. *Cornell*.
- W. E. Caldwell, A.B. Cornell 1910. Roman Society under the Julian and Claudian Principes. *Columbia*.
- L. A. Lawson, A.B. Upsala College 1909; A.M. Columbia 1911. Social Conditions in the Principate of Augustus. *Columbia*.
- E. D. Pierce, A.B. Vassar 1910, A.M. 1912. Asinius Pollio. *Columbia*.
- J. J. van Nostrand, A.B. Chicago 1905; A.M. Leland Stanford 1911. The Administration of Spain under Augustus. *California*.
- M. F. Lawton, A.B. Columbia 1904, A.M. 1913. Philanthropy in Rome and Italy under the Early Roman Empire. *Columbia*.
- Margaret Bancroft, A.B. Wellesley 1912; A.M. Columbia 1913. The Popular Assemblies in the Municipalities of Spain and Gaul. *Columbia*.
- Maud Hamilton, A.B. Cornell 1902. The Sources of Metal and Ore Supplies in the Roman Empire. *Wisconsin*.
- R. P. Blake, A.B. California 1908; A.M. Harvard 1909. Imperial Legislation on Religious Matters during the Later Roman Empire. *Harvard*.
- Dora Askowith, A.B. Barnard 1908; A.M. Columbia 1909. Documents on the History of the Jews during the Roman Empire. *Columbia*.
- T. M. Dadson, A.B. McMaster 1906, A.M. 1909, Th.B. 1909. Persistence of Paganism in the Roman Empire. *Chicago*.
- R. R. Powell, A.B. Rochester 1911. The Development in Roman and in English Law of Remedies against Fraud. *Columbia*.
- P. B. Whitehead, A.B. Beloit 1906; M.A. Yale 1908, B.D. 1910. The Conversion of Pagan Buildings in the City of Rome into Christian Churches. *Harvard*.

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

- C. H. Lyttle, A.B. Western Reserve 1907, A.M. 1908; B.D. Meadville 1910. Bar-Daisan of Edessa: his Influence upon the Doctrines of Mani the Persian. *Harvard*.
- Dudley Tyng, A.B. Harvard 1902, A.M. 1904; B.D. Episcopal Theological School 1909. Theodore of Mopsuestia. *Harvard*.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

- T. P. Oakley, A.B. Columbia 1909. The Penitentials. *Columbia*.
- T. C. Van Cleve, A.B. Missouri 1911. The Celtic Element in the Civilization of the Carolingian Empire. *Wisconsin*.

- R. H. George, A.B. Amherst 1911; A.M. Harvard 1914. The Relations of England and Flanders, 1066-1215. *Harvard*.
- Einar Joranson, A.B. Augustana 1908; A.M. Wisconsin 1914. The Monastic Ideal of Service in the Twelfth Century. *Wisconsin*.
- H. H. Maurer, A.B. Wisconsin 1907, A.M. 1909; Ph.D. Chicago 1914. Feudal Procedure in the Courts of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. *Chicago*.
- A. C. Krey, A.B. Wisconsin 1907, A.M. 1908. The Latin Patriarchate in the Kingdom of Jerusalem. *Wisconsin*.
- E. H. Byrne, Litt.B. Wisconsin 1903. Genoese Colonies in Syria, 1100-1300. *Wisconsin*.
- M. R. Gutsch, A.B. Wisconsin 1908, A.M. 1909. Preparations for the Fourth Crusade. *Wisconsin*.
- J. R. Knipfing, A.B. Cornell 1911. The Social Activities of the Franciscans in Western Europe during the Thirteenth Century. *Columbia*.
- R. B. Yewdale, A.B. Wisconsin 1914. Life at Avignon under the Popes. *Wisconsin*.
- R. A. Newhall, A.B. Minnesota 1910, A.M. 1911. The English in Normandy, 1417-1422. *Harvard*.
- G. B. Hatfield, A.B. Oberlin 1908, S.T.B. 1908; S.T.M. Harvard 1914. The Influence of the Nominalistic Philosophy upon the Reformation Doctrine of the Church with especial Reference to the Period following the Council of Basel. *Harvard*.

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

- A. P. Evans, A.B. Cornell 1911. Religious Tolerance in the Age of the Reformation (1516-1530). *Cornell*.
- Rudolph Kastanek, A.B. New York 1913. The Religious Policies of the House of Hapsburg in Bohemia from 1526 to 1781. *Columbia*.
- N. A. Olsen, A.B. Luther 1907; A.M. Wisconsin 1909. Trade Relations between England and the Scandinavian Countries from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century. *Harvard*.
- C. L. Grose, A.B. Findlay 1910; A.M. Harvard 1914. Anglo-French Relations, 1672-1685. *Harvard*.
- F. A. Middlebush, A.B., A.M., Michigan 1914. The Diplomatic Relations between England and Holland, 1678-1688. *Michigan*.
- Frances Marion Fay, A.B. Radcliffe 1912, A.M. 1913. Trade Policy of England and France from 1689 to 1715. *Radcliffe*.
- A. W. Nagler, S.T.B. Garrett Biblical Institute 1910; S.T.M. Harvard 1913. The Significance of Pietism in the Origin and Development of Methodism. *Harvard*.
- Anne E. Burlingame, A.B. Syracuse 1900; A.M. Columbia 1910. The Anti-Slavery Movement in England and France in the Eighteenth Century. *Columbia*.
- J. A. C. Mason, A.B. Toronto 1905. The Continental System and the Orders in Council. *Columbia*.
- Margaret W. Piersol, A.B. Vassar 1912; A.M. Pennsylvania 1914. Eng-

land and France in the Mediterranean during the Continental System. *Pennsylvania.*

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

- A. J. Meyer, A.B. Rutgers 1900; A.M. New Brunswick Theological Seminary 1904. A History of the Observance of the Lord's Day, with Special Reference to Great Britain. *Columbia.*
- W. O. Ault, A.B. Baker 1907; B.A. Oxford 1910. The Private Court in England. *Yale.*
- J. E. Miller, A.B. Kansas 1910; A.M. Illinois 1913. Benefit of Clergy in England. *Illinois.*
- C. A. Smith, A.B. Kansas 1908; A.M. Yale 1909. The English Liberty (Immunity). *Yale.*
- James Kenny, A.B. Toronto 1907; A.M. Wisconsin 1908. An Introduction to the Sources for the Early History of Ireland. *Columbia.*
- A. H. Sweet, A.B. Bowdoin 1913; A.M. Harvard 1914. The Ecclesiastical Relations of the English Benedictines. *Cornell.*
- J. L. Moore, A.B. Harvard 1914. The Lawmen and the Justiciar. *Harvard.*
- E. S. Morris, A.B. Cornell 1914. The Royal Taxation of the Clergy in England. *Cornell.*
- C. W. New, A.B. Toronto 1903; Th.B. McMaster 1906, D.B. 1907; Ph.D. Chicago 1913. History of the Alien Priories in England to the Confiscation of Henry V. *Chicago.*
- C. W. David, B.A. Oxford 1911; A.M. Wisconsin 1912. Robert Court-hose. *Harvard.*
- H. H. Holt, B.A. Oxford 1908; A.M. Wisconsin 1909. The Cost of Living in England, 1172-1183. *Wisconsin.*
- H. A. Kellar, A.B. Chicago 1909. King John: the Interdict and Exchequer. *Wisconsin.*
- Lyman Howes, A.B. Leland Stanford 1906; A.M. Columbia 1911. Educational Theories and Educational Influence of Roger Bacon. *Columbia.*
- Carl Wittke, A.B. Ohio 1913; A.M. Harvard 1914. The History of Parliamentary Privilege. *Harvard.*
- Frederic Schenck, A.B. Harvard 1909; Litt.B. Oxford 1912; A.M. Harvard 1914. The English Merchant Class in the Fourteenth Century. *Harvard.*
- P. G. Mode, A.B. McMaster 1897, A.M. 1898, Th.B. 1899. The Influence of the Black Death on the Church in England. *Chicago.*
- W. A. Gifford, A.B. Toronto 1904, B.D. 1909; S.T.M. Harvard 1914. The Lollard Element in the English Reformation. *Harvard.*
- Elizabeth F. Jackson, A.B. Wellesley 1913; A.M. Pennsylvania 1914. The Lord Lieutenant of the English County in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. *Pennsylvania.*
- F. C. Dietz, A.B. Pennsylvania 1909; A.M. Harvard 1912. English Finances under the Tudors. *Harvard.*

- Susan M. Lough, Ph.B. Chicago 1907, Ph.M. 1909. Administration of Ireland in the Time of Elizabeth. *Chicago*.
- H. M. Wriston, A.B. Wesleyan 1911, A.M. 1912. The English Monarchomachs. *Harvard*.
- T. R. Galbraith, B.S. Pennsylvania 1897. The First Five Years of the British East India Company. *Pennsylvania*.
- J. E. Gillespie, A.B. Cornell 1909; A.M. Harvard 1910. The Influence of Oversea Expansion on England to 1700. *Columbia*.
- R. B. Westerfield, A.B. Ohio Northern University 1907, A.M. 1910; A.M. Yale 1911. The Mercantile Organization in England in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. *Yale*.
- F. W. Pitman, Ph.B. Yale 1904, A.M. 1906. The History of the Sugar Industry in the British Empire in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. *Yale*.
- A. J. Klein, A.B. Wabash 1906; B.D. Union Theological Seminary 1909; A.M. Columbia 1909. The Sources for Tolerance in England during the Reign of James I. *Columbia*.
- Mabelle Louise Moses, A.B. Leland Stanford 1899; A.M. Radcliffe 1908. The Economic Policy of Charles I. and the Commonwealth. *Radcliffe*.
- T. C. Pease, Ph.B. Chicago 1907, Ph.D. 1914. John Lilburn and the Levellers. *Chicago*.
- A. C. Dudley, Princeton Theological Seminary 1907. The Clarendon Code in England, 1660-1689. *Johns Hopkins*.
- P. C. Galpin, A.B. Yale 1910, A.M. 1912. The Rise of Political Non-conformity in England after 1660. *Yale*.
- G. F. Zook, A.B. Kansas 1906, A.M. 1907. The Royal African Company, 1662-1715. *Cornell*.
- E. B. Russell, Ph.B. Vermont 1906. Action of the Privy Council on Colonial Legislation. *Columbia*.
- W. T. Morgan, A.B. Ohio 1909; A.M. Harvard 1910. The Whig Party, 1700-1720. *Yale*.
- O. H. Draper, A.B. Johns Hopkins 1910; B.D. Drew 1912. Ecclesiastical Politics under James II. *Columbia*.
- Alden Anderson, A.B. Bethany 1910. British Trade in the Baltic in the Eighteenth Century. *Yale*.
- J. R. H. Moore, A.B. Boston 1899, A.M. 1906. The English Colonial System under the Hanoverians. *Harvard*.
- Mary G. Young, A.B. Cornell 1898, A.M. 1908. The Organization of the Whig Party under Sir Robert Walpole. *Yale*.
- Judith B. Williams, A.B. Vassar 1912; A.M. Columbia 1913. An Introduction to the Literature and Sources for the English Industrial Revolution. *Columbia*.
- L. S. Mayo, A.B. Harvard 1910, A.M. 1911. The Political and Military Career of Jeffrey Amherst. *Harvard*.
- N. Macdonald, A.B. Queen's (Kingston) 1913. Henry Dundas, first Lord Melville (1742-1811). *Cornell*.

- F. F. Rosenblatt, A.B. Columbia 1907, A.M. 1908. *History of the Chartist Movement. Columbia.*

FRANCE

- N. S. Parker, A.B. Chicago 1911; A.M. Harvard 1912. *Trade Routes in Southern France in the Middle Ages. Chicago.*
- C. G. Kelly, A.B. Johns Hopkins 1908. *French Protestantism on the Eve of the Religious Wars, 1559-1562. Johns Hopkins.*
- J. S. Will, A.B. Toronto 1897. *The Persecution of the Huguenots in France under Louis XIV. Columbia.*
- L. B. Packard, A.B. Harvard 1909. *Economic Aspects of the French Royal Policy, 1700-1756. Harvard.*
- M. P. Cushing, A.B. Bowdoin 1909; A.M. Columbia 1912. *Baron d'Holbach. Columbia.*
- C. O. Hardy, A.B. Ottawa 1904. *The Race Question during the French Revolution. Chicago.*
- Eloise Ellery, A.B. Vassar 1897. *Brissot de Warville. Cornell.*
- W. A. Frayer, A.B. Cornell 1903. *Marat. Cornell.*
- A. L. Barton, A.B. Chicago 1900. *Marat's Opinion of the Men of the French Revolution. Cornell.*
- Ellen H. Adams, A.B. Cornell 1913. *Billaud-Varenne in the French Revolution. Cornell.*
- F. L. Nussbaum, A.B. Cornell 1906. *Ducher: an Exponent of the American Influence in the French Revolution, with particular reference to Commercial Legislation. Pennsylvania.*
- P. W. MacDonald, A.B. Wisconsin 1910, A.M. 1911. *A Study of the Committee of Public Safety during the Reign of Terror, with regard to its Centralizing Policy and its Relations to the Local Authorities. Wisconsin.*
- Lucy Lewis, A.B. Bryn Mawr 1893. *The Continental System and French Industry. Pennsylvania.*
- E. P. Brush, A.B. Smith 1909; A.M. Illinois 1912. *François Pierre Guillaume Guizot, the Historian. Illinois.*

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

- A. F. Peine, A.B. Wesleyan 1911; A.M. Illinois 1913. *Cola di Rienzi and the Popular Revival of the Empire. Illinois.*
- Keith Vosburg, A.B. California 1910; A.B. Oxford 1913. *Milan under the Visconti. Harvard.*
- Gertrude B. Richards, A.B. Cape Girardeau 1909; A.M. Wellesley 1910. *The Younger Pico della Mirandola. Cornell.*
- D. F. Grass, Ph.B. Iowa College 1894; A.B. Harvard 1898, A.M. 1899. *Antonio Serra's Breve Trattato: the Beginning of Political Economy in Italy. Leland Stanford.*
- Julius Klein, Litt.B. California 1907, Litt.M. 1908. *The Mesta: a Study in Spanish Economic History, 1273-1835. Harvard.*
- J. G. McDonald, A.B. Indiana 1909, A.M. 1910. *The Spanish Corregidor: Origin and Development. Harvard.*

- C. E. McGuire, A.B. Harvard 1911, A.M. 1912. *The Right of Asylum in the Middle Ages, with special Reference to Spain.* *Harvard.*
- A. Neuman, B.S. Columbia 1909, A.M. 1912. *Jewish Communal Life in Spain during the Thirteenth Century.* *Columbia.*
- C. H. Haring, A.B. 1907; Litt.B. Oxford 1909. *Trade and Navigation between Spain and the Indies during the Reign of Charles V.* *Harvard.*
- F. E. J. Wilde, A.B. Wisconsin 1911, A.M. 1912. *The Career of Don Antonio of Portugal.* *Pennsylvania.*

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

- K. R. Greenfield, A.B. Western Maryland 1911. *Paternal Government in Medieval Cities of the Lower Rhine.* *Johns Hopkins.*
- Helen Boyce, Ed.B. Chicago 1905. *The Duchy of Brunswick under Henry the Younger (1517-1568) and his Son Julius (1568-1589): an Economic Study.* *Chicago.*
- Mabel E. Hodder, A.B. Syracuse 1895; A.M. Minnesota 1900; Radcliffe 1904. *Peter Binsfeld and Cornelius Loos: an Episode in the History of Witchcraft.* *Cornell.*
- F. C. Church, A.B. Cornell 1909. *Boniface Amerbach and his Circle.* *Cornell.*
- C. F. Lemke, A.B. Wisconsin 1903. *The Opposition to Stein's Reforms in Prussia.* *Chicago.*
- D. O. Clark, A.B. Drury 1890; A.M. Illinois 1909. *Stein's Principles of Administration.* *Illinois.*

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

- Paul Fox, A.B. Western Reserve 1906, A.M. 1908; B.D. Oberlin 1907. *Phases in the Social and Economic History of Poland.* *Johns Hopkins.*
- Alexander Baltzly, A.B. Harvard 1912, A.M. 1913. *Russia's Entry into European Politics: Tsar Alexis Mikhailovich in the Great Northern War.* *Harvard.*
- Cleanthes Vassardakis, LL.D. National University of Athens 1910; S.D. University of Geneva 1908. *The Bank of Greece.* *Chicago.*

THE FAR EAST AND INDIA

- J. K. Wright, A.B. Harvard 1913; A.M. 1914. *A Study of European Knowledge of the Far East in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries.* *Harvard.*
- C. H. Cunningham, B.L. California 1909, M.L. 1910. *The Audiencia in the Philippine Islands.* *California.*
- William L. Schurz, B.L. California 1911; M.L. 1912. *The Manila Galeon.* *California.*
- K. C. Leebrick, S.B. California, 1911; S.M. 1913. *The English Expedition to Manila in 1762, and the Government of the Philippine Islands by the East India Company.* *California.*

- S. Kitasawa, A.B. Waseda 1910; A.M. North Carolina 1911. History and Growth of National Indebtedness in Japan. *Johns Hopkins*.
- P. L. Gillette, A.B. Colorado College 1897; A.M. Yale 1909. The History of Corean Gilds. *Yale*.
- H. L. Reed, A.B. Oberlin 1911. The Currency Policy of India since 1898. *Cornell*.
- L. H. Davis, B.S. Pennsylvania 1901, LL.B. 1904, A.M. 1912. The Doctrine of Spheres of Influence and the Open-Door Policy in China. *Pennsylvania*.

AMERICA: GENERAL

- H. H. Holmes, Ph.B. Alabama Normal 1904. History of the Denominational Control of Education in the United States. *Columbia*.
- Carrie M. Lewis, A.B. Cornell 1903. A History of the Literature of Abolition. *Cornell*.
- L. E. Crossman, A.B. Michigan 1913, A.M. 1914. Literary Campaign against Abolition. *Michigan*.
- W. E. Rich, A.B. Wesleyan 1911, A.M. 1912. The History of the Post Office in the United States. *Harvard*.
- Lucia von Lueck Becker, Ph.B. Chicago 1909, Ph.M. 1911. The History of the Admission of New States into the Union. *Chicago*.
- A. H. Buffington, A.B. Williams 1907; A.M. Harvard 1909. The Spirit of Expansion in the United States prior to 1860. *Harvard*.
- J. L. Goebel, jr., A.B. Illinois 1912, A.M. 1913. Recognition of De Facto Governments by the United States. *Illinois*.
- K. W. Colgrove, A.B. Iowa 1909, A.M. 1910. The Early History of State Instructions to Senators and Representatives in Congress. *Harvard*.
- A. P. James, A.B. Randolph-Macon 1906; B.A. Oxford 1910; A.M. Chicago 1912. The Constitutional Responsibilities of the Secretary of the Treasury. *Chicago*.
- Q. Wright, A.B. Lombard 1912; A.M. Illinois 1913. The Extent to which the Principles of International Law have been Incorporated in the Municipal Law of the United States. *Illinois*.
- Ralston Hayden, A.B. Knox 1910; A.M. Michigan 1911. The Treaty-making Power of the United States Senate. *Michigan*.
- T. P. Martin, A.B. Leland Stanford 1913; A.M. California 1914. The Confirmation of Foreign Land Titles in the Acquired Territories of the United States. *Harvard*.
- C. H. Crennan, A.B. Indiana 1913, A.M. 1914. The American State Executive. *Pennsylvania*.
- A. W. Lovell, A.B. Dartmouth 1903; LL.B. Boston 1907, LL.M. 1907. The History of the Office of Attorney-General in the United States. *Yale*.
- E. C. Evans, A.B. Missouri 1910, A.M. 1912. The History of the Australian Ballot System in the United States. *Chicago*.

- A. C. Henry, A.B. Franklin and Marshall 1910. The Influence of the United States in the Movement for International Arbitration and Peace. *Pennsylvania*.
- O. C. Ault, A.B. Tri-State 1907; A.B. Defiance 1911. The Recent Development of Socialism in the United States. *Chicago*.

AMERICA: GENERAL, ECONOMIC

- Mary J. Lanier, S.B. Chicago 1909. Geographical Influence on the Development of Atlantic Seaports. *Chicago*.
- R. M. Tryon, A.B. Indiana 1907, A.M. 1912. Household Manufactures in the United States, 1640-1860. *Chicago*.
- H. A. Wooster, A.B. Wesleyan 1909, A.M. 1910. The Rise of a Wage-Earning Class in the United States. *Yale*.
- F. E. Richter, A.B. Harvard 1913. The History of the Copper Industry in the United States. *Harvard*.
- L. M. Crosgrave, A.B. Indiana 1909; A.M. Harvard 1911. The History of the Glass Industry in the United States. *Harvard*.
- A. H. Cole, A.B. Bowdoin 1911; A.M. Harvard 1913. The History of the Woollen Manufacturing Industry in the United States. *Harvard*.
- C. K. Knight, A.B. Ohio 1912, A.M. 1913. The History of Life Insurance in the United States. *Illinois*.
- E. H. Hahne, A.B. Nebraska 1911, LL.B. 1913; A.M. Harvard 1914. The History of the Meat Packing Industry in the United States. *Harvard*.
- J. Anton De Hass, A.B. Leland Stanford 1910; A.M. Harvard 1911. History of the Wage Theories of American Economists. *Leland Stanford*.
- W. L. Abbott, A.B. Pennsylvania 1911, A.M. 1913, LL.B. 1913. Development of the Theory of the Tariff in the United States. *Pennsylvania*.
- D. S. Hanchett, A.B. Wisconsin 1910. History of the Commercial Policy of the United States. *Pennsylvania*.
- T. F. Leilich, A.B. Washington (St. Louis) 1912. A History of Railroad Capitalization in the United States. *Cornell*.
- F. H. Gilman, A.B. Wesleyan 1909; A.M. Cornell 1910. Federal Supervision of Banks. *Cornell*.
- F. L. Cummings, A.B. Chicago 1904, A.M. 1911. The Development of Prairie Agriculture. *Chicago*.

AMERICA: IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

- G. A. Washburne, A.B. Ohio State 1907; A.M. Columbia 1913. Imperial Control over the Administration of Justice in the American Colonies. *Columbia*.
- J. P. Gillespie, A.B. Columbia 1905; B.D. Union Theological Seminary 1907. The Influence of Religious Ideas on American Colonial Life. *Columbia*.
- James R. Young, A.B. Leland Stanford 1909, A.M. 1910. The Relation

- of Church and Clergy to Education in the Thirteen American Colonies. *Chicago*.
- A. A. Holtz, A.B. Colgate 1909; Ph.M. Chicago 1910, D.B. 1911, Ph.D. 1914. The Moral and Religious Element in American Education to 1800. *Chicago*.
- Hubert Phillips, A.B. Chattanooga 1908; A.M. Columbia 1913. The Development of the Residential Qualification on Suffrage in the American Colonies. *Columbia*.
- V. W. Crane, A.B. Michigan 1911; A.M. Harvard 1912. The Southern Frontier of the English Colonies in America, 1670-1763: Relations with the Indians, French, and Spanish. *Pennsylvania*.
- Charles J. Faust, A.B. North Dakota 1908; A.M. Wisconsin 1912. The Relation of the Southern Colonies to the Indians before the Revolution. *Chicago*.
- A. P. Scott, A.B. Princeton 1904; B.D. Chicago Theological Seminary 1910. A Comparative Study of the Criminal Legislation of Massachusetts and Virginia in Colonial Times. *Chicago*.
- H. J. Coppock, A.B. Earlham 1904, A.M. 1908. Immigration into the American Colonies in the Eighteenth Century. *Columbia*.
- W. W. Kemp, A.B. Leland Stanford 1898. Educational Work in the American Colonies of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1701-1783. *Columbia*.
- C. H. Maxson, A.B. Rochester 1892, A.M. 1895. The Great Awakening. *Chicago*.
- R. V. Harlow, A.B. Yale 1909, A.M. 1911. The History of Legislative Committees, 1750-1800. *Yale*.
- Louise F. Perring, B.S. Temple 1909; A.M. Pennsylvania 1912. The Policy of Imperial Defense in the Southern Colonies during the French and Indian War. *Pennsylvania*.
- J. A. Hofto, A.B. North Dakota 1913, A.M. 1914. John Stuart, Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Southern Department. *Illinois*.
- A. H. Basye, A.B. Kansas 1904, A.M. 1906. The Office of Secretary of State for America. *Yale*.
- C. D. Johns, A.B. Randolph-Macon 1908; A.M. Chicago 1911. The Southern Loyalists. *Chicago*.
- E. E. Curtis, A.B. Yale 1910. The Organization of the British Army in the American Revolution. *Yale*.
- Leita M. Davis, A.B. Michigan 1911. Proposals to Amend the Articles of Confederation. *Pennsylvania*.
- L. H. Gipson, A.B. Idaho 1903; B.A. Oxford 1907. Jared Ingersoll. *Chicago*.
- A. M. Schlesinger, A.B. Ohio State 1910; A.M. Columbia 1911. The Association of the First Congress. *Columbia*.
- J. L. Deming, A.B. Cincinnati 1899; A.M. Bethany 1900. Immigration to the United States, 1776-1820: a Study in Causes and Effects. *Columbia*.

- Vernon Stauffer, A.B. Hiram 1901. *Illuminism in America. Columbia.*
- C. E. Sweitzer, A.B. Johns Hopkins 1908; A.M. Pennsylvania 1914. *The Influence of John Jay in American Diplomacy. Pennsylvania.*
- Orpha E. Leavitt, A. B. English Policy towards the United States, 1783-1795. *Wisconsin.*
- A. L. Kohlmeier, A.B. Indiana 1908; A.M. Harvard 1911. *Commerce between the United States and the Dutch from 1783 to 1789. Harvard.*
- Jane M. Berry, Ph.B. Chicago 1904; A.M. Columbia 1913. *Relations between the United States and Spain in the Southwest between 1793 and 1795. Chicago.*
- W. A. Robinson, A.B. Bowdoin 1907; A.M. Wisconsin 1910. *The Republican Party in New England, 1793-1815. Yale.*
- S. F. Bemis, A.B. Clark College 1912; A.M. Clark University 1913. *The History and Diplomacy of the Jay Treaty. Harvard.*
- D. R. Anderson, A.B. Randolph-Macon 1900, A.M. 1901; Ph.D. Chicago 1912. *William Branch Giles: a Biography. Chicago.*
- Catherine C. Cleveland, Litt.B. Wisconsin 1894; Ph.D. Chicago 1914. *The Great Revival in the West, 1797-1805. Chicago.*
- Peter Hoekstra, A.B. Michigan 1910, A.M. 1911. *The Relations between the United States and the Netherlands, 1803-1840. Pennsylvania.*
- Anna C. Clauder, A.B. Bryn Mawr 1905. *The Napoleonic Wars as Reflected on the Commerce to Philadelphia and New York from 1806 to 1812. Pennsylvania.*
- H. C. Hockett, A.B. Wisconsin 1903. *Political Parties in the United States from 1815 to 1825. Wisconsin.*
- P. L. White, A.B. Bowdoin 1914. *The Relations between France and the United States, 1815-1848. Pennsylvania.*
- R. W. Neeser, A.B. Yale 1906, A.M. 1909. *Operations of the American Navy on the Coast of Africa in Connection with the Suppression of the Slave Trade. Yale.*
- T. N. Hoover, A.B. Ohio 1905, A.M. 1906; A.M. Harvard 1907. *The Monroe Doctrine. Harvard.*
- R. T. Hearon, A.B. George Peabody College 1906; A.M. Wisconsin 1913. *The American Free-Trade Movement, 1824-1860. Wisconsin.*
- D. C. Orbison, Litt.B. Princeton 1912. *American Diplomatic Relations with Russia since 1824. Pennsylvania.*
- Florence Robinson, A.M. Wisconsin 1892. *Social Movements, 1825-1860. Wisconsin.*
- Marie P. Dickoré, A.B. Cincinnati 1907, A.M. 1908. *The Public Land System in the Thirties. Wisconsin.*
- A. E. Martin, A.B. William Jewell 1908, A.M. 1912. *The Anti-Slavery Movement in the Southwest before 1840. Cornell.*
- E. E. Robinson, A.B. Wisconsin 1908, A.M. 1910. *Political Grouping, 1832-1840: the Rise of the Whig Party. Wisconsin.*
- G. H. Barnes, A.B. Michigan 1912, A.M. 1913. *The Abolitionists and*

- the Slavery Issue as Illustrated by the Struggle for Right of Petition in Congress. *Pennsylvania*.
- E. A. Kincaid, A.B. State College of Washington 1910; A.M. Harvard 1911. The Locofoco Movement. *Harvard*.
- R. C. McGrane, A.B. Cincinnati 1912, A.M. 1913. The Crisis of 1837. *Chicago*.
- R. J. Ray, A.B. Kansas 1908, A.M. 1909. The History of the Financial Crises of 1837 and 1839 in the United States. *Harvard*.
- D. R. Fox, A.B. Columbia 1911, A.M. 1912. The Campaign of 1840. *Columbia*.
- W. O. Lynch, A.B. Indiana 1903; A.M. Wisconsin 1908. A History of the Whig Party in the Northwest from 1840. *Harvard*.
- J. N. Norwood, A.B. Alfred 1906; A.M. Michigan 1909. The Slavery Schism in the Methodist Episcopal Church. *Cornell*.
- Martha L. Edwards, A.M. Wisconsin 1913. Religion and Politics, 1850-1860. *Wisconsin*.
- Birl E. Schulz, A.B. DePauw 1909; A.M. Columbia 1911. Justice McLean and the Dred Scott Decision. *Columbia*.
- H. A. Foster, A.B. Yale 1907; A.M. Chicago 1912. Life of John J. Crittenden. *Chicago*.
- Wilfred Eldred, A.B. Washington and Lee 1909, A.M. 1909; A.M. Harvard 1911. Wheat Production and the Wheat and Flour Trade in the United States since 1860. *Harvard*.
- A. R. Ellingwood, A.B. Colorado College 1910; B.C.L. Oxford 1913. Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Great Britain during the Civil War. *Pennsylvania*.
- W. W. Pierson, jr., A.B. Alabama 1910, A.M. 1911; A.M. Columbia 1912. A History of the Committee on the Conduct of the War. *Columbia*.
- F. C. White, A.B. Alfred 1895, A.M. 1902. The Draft during the Civil War. *Columbia*.
- G. L. Kieffer, A.B. Pennsylvania College 1909. The Attitude of the Lutherans in America toward the Civil War and Reconstruction. *Columbia*.
- J. F. Ebersole, Ph.B. Chicago 1907; A.M. Harvard 1909. The History of the National Banking System, 1864-1874. *Chicago*.
- O. C. Hormell, A.B. Indiana 1904, A.M. 1905; A.M. Harvard 1909. Contemporary Opinion respecting the Granting of Negro Suffrage. *Harvard*.
- J. W. Oliver, A.B. Missouri 1911, A.M. 1912. History of the Pension Movement to 1885. *Wisconsin*.
- W. C. Harris, Ph.B. Chicago 1904; A.M. Michigan 1909; Ph.D. Chicago 1914. The Public Career of Zachariah Chandler. *Chicago*.
- E. D. Ross, Ph.B. Syracuse 1909, Ph.M. 1910; A.M. Cornell 1912. The Liberal Republican Movement. *Cornell*.
- E. B. Patton, A.B. Washington 1904; A.M. Chicago 1907, Ph.D. 1908. Resumption of Specie Payment in 1879. *Chicago*.

- G. D. Bradley, A.B. Michigan 1907, A.M. 1913. History of the Santa Fé Railroad. *Michigan*.
- D. L. McMurry, A.B. Beloit 1911; A.M. Wisconsin 1913. The History of the Pension Movement, 1885 to present. *Wisconsin*.
- J. Tanger, Ph.B. Franklin and Marshall 1909; A.M. Pennsylvania 1912. Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the United States since 1889. *Pennsylvania*.
- H. G. Hodges, Litt.B. Princeton 1911; A.M. Pennsylvania 1914. Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Great Britain, 1893-1897. *Pennsylvania*.
- J. A. Dunaway, A.B. Park College 1910, A.M. 1912. Recent Diplomatic Relations of the United States with Japan. *Pennsylvania*.

AMERICA: IN LOCAL ORDER

NEW ENGLAND

- P. W. Bidwell, A.B. Yale 1910. History of Agriculture in New England. *Yale*.
- J. C. Zeller, A.B. Chicago 1904, B.D. 1905; A.M. Chattanooga 1906. History of New England Legislation on Education, 1776-1830. *Chicago*.
- B. J. Baldwin, A.B. Wesleyan 1902; A.B. Yale 1903; B.D. Union Theological Seminary 1908. The Decay of the New England Parish. *Columbia*.
- Mary Merrick Goodwin, A.B. Bryn Mawr 1909. The Massachusetts Colonial Agency in England. *Bryn Mawr*.
- Blanche Evans Hazard, A.B. Radcliffe 1907, A.M. 1913. History of the Shoe Industry in Massachusetts. *Radcliffe*.
- G. A. Wood, A.B. Amherst 1906. The Career of Governor William Shirley. *Columbia*.
- H. H. Burbank, A.B. Dartmouth 1909, A.M. 1910. The History of the General Property Taxation in Massachusetts since 1775. *Harvard*.
- W. F. Hall, A.B. Harvard 1909, A.M. 1910. The Political History of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, 1830-1840. *Harvard*.
- J. W. E. Bowen, jr., A.B. Wesleyan 1911; A.M. Harvard 1913. The Political History of Massachusetts, 1840-1850. *Harvard*.
- Edith E. Ware, A.B. Goucher 1905; A.M. Columbia 1908. Political Opinion in Massachusetts during the Civil War and Reconstruction. *Columbia*.
- G. S. Dow, A.B. William Jewell 1909; A.M. Brown 1911. The Social History of Martha's Vineyard. *Chicago*.
- R. J. Purcell, A.B. Minnesota 1910, A.M. 1911. The Connecticut Constitution of 1818. *Yale*.
- J. P. Senning, A.B. Union 1908. Legislation and Legislative Methods in Connecticut since 1818. *Yale*.

MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

- H. E. Brown, B.S. New York 1910, J.D. 1911, A.M. 1912. The Origin and Development of the Office of Public Prosecutor in the Colony of New York. *New York*.
- R. B. Munson, Ph.B. Yale 1909, A.M. 1911. The Growth of Assembly Control in New York, 1700-1760. *Yale*.
- R. F. Seybolt, Ph.B. Brown 1910, A.M. 1911. Education through the Apprenticeship System in Colonial New York. *Columbia*.
- J. P. Selden, A.B. Olivet 1900; A.M. New York 1912. The Development of the Office of Mayor in New York City. *New York*.
- A. E. Peterson, A.B. Tufts 1888, A.M. 1892. New York as an Eighteenth-Century Municipality to 1730. *Columbia*.
- G. W. Edwards, A.B. City of New York 1911. New York as an Eighteenth Century Municipality, 1730-1776. *Columbia*.
- A. O. Miller, jr., A.B. New York 1893, LL.B. 1895; LL.M. Columbia 1896; J.D. New York 1908. The Revolutionary Government of the State of New York, Central and Local. *New York*.
- W. W. Feigenbaum, A.B. Columbia 1907, A.M. 1908. Ratification of the Federal Constitution in New York. *Columbia*.
- C. A. Phillips, A.B. Central 1904; A.B. Yale 1908, A.M. 1909. History of Manufactures in New York. *Yale*.
- M. B. Foster, A.B. Carson and Newman 1910, A.M. 1911. A History of Banking in the State of New York. *Cornell*.
- M. A. Hunter, A.B. Muskingum 1912; A.M. Princeton 1913. A History of Corporation Taxes in New York State. *Cornell*.
- L. A. Frye, A.B. Minnesota 1907, A.M. 1908. History of the State Control of Public Service Corporations in New York. *Columbia*.
- R. H. Gabriel, A.B. Yale 1913. The Economic History of Long Island. *Yale*.
- Mary Alice Hanna, A.B. Missouri 1909, B.S. 1911. Colonial Trade of Pennsylvania. *Bryn Mawr*.
- M. K. Turner, A.B. Dickinson 1905; A.M. Harvard 1910. The Commercial Relations of the Susquehanna Valley during the Eighteenth Century. *Pennsylvania*.
- A. L. Trachtenberg, A.B. Trinity 1911; A.M. Yale 1912. The History of Mining Legislation in Pennsylvania. *Yale*.
- H. W. Kochenderfer, A.B. Ursinus 1901; A.M. Pennsylvania 1911. Pennsylvania during the Civil War. *Pennsylvania*.
- R. R. Ammarell, A.B. Muhlenberg 1911; A.M. Columbia 1912. The Politics of Pennsylvania during the Civil War and Reconstruction. *Columbia*.
- C. E. Asnis, A.B. Pennsylvania 1904, LL.B. 1907, A.M. 1913. The Revision of the State Constitution of Pennsylvania, with Special Reference to Finance and Taxation. *Pennsylvania*.
- F. W. Breimeier, A.B. Bucknell 1910; A.M. Pennsylvania 1914. The Struggle for Municipal Home Rule in Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania*.

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

- H. B. Crothers, A.B. Monmouth 1903. The Defence of the Colonies of Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas, 1750-1756. *Yale*.
- Lily F. Trevvett, A.B. Richmond (Va.) 1909. Loyalism in Maryland. *Johns Hopkins*.
- F. J. Tschan, A.B. Loyola 1901, A.M. 1903. The Virginia Plantation. *Chicago*.
- D. C. MacBryde, A.B. Washington and Lee 1896; A.M. Yale 1912. Planter and Plantation in Early Virginia. *Yale*.
- P. S. Flippin, A.B. Richmond (Va.) 1906. Royal Government in Virginia. *Johns Hopkins*.
- G. F. Wells, B.S. Columbia 1907, A.M. 1908. Educational Conditions in Colonial Virginia, as shown through the Parish Records. *Columbia*.
- G. V. Burroughs, S.B. Whitman 1909; A.M. Chicago 1912. History of the Virginia House of Burgesses in the Eighteenth Century. *Chicago*.
- L. K. Koontz, A.B. Washington and Lee 1908. The Virginia Frontier in the French and Indian Wars. *Johns Hopkins*.
- J. M. Leake, A.B. Randolph-Macon 1902. The Virginia Committee System of the American Revolution. *Johns Hopkins*.
- E. L. Fox, A.B. Randolph-Macon 1909. Political Parties in Virginia, 1776-1801. *Johns Hopkins*.
- E. J. Woodhouse, A.B. Randolph-Macon 1903; LL.B. Virginia 1907. Virginia and Nullification. *Chicago*.
- W. W. Carson, A.B. Wofford 1907; A.M. Trinity 1908. Social and Economic Reconstruction in North Carolina. *Wisconsin*.
- W. S. Boyce, A.B. Wake Forest 1903; A.M. Chicago 1907. The Social and Economic History of Eastern North Carolina since 1890. *Columbia*.
- A. A. Hirsh, A.B. Cornell 1901; B.D. Chicago 1907. The Huguenots in South Carolina. *Chicago*.
- D. H. Bacot, jr., A.B. Charleston 1908, A.M. 1909; A.M. Harvard 1910. The Progress of South Carolina, 1783-1800. *Harvard*.
- W. B. Smith, A.B. Chicago 1902. White Servitude in South Carolina. *Chicago*.
- C. S. Boucher, A.B. Michigan 1909, A.M. 1910. South Carolina Politics from Nullification to Secession. *Michigan*.
- Laura A. White, A.B. Nebraska 1904. The Life of Robert Barnwell Rhett. *Chicago*.
- F. K. Deming, Ph.B. Drake 1908, A.M. 1911. The Relations of South Carolina to the Confederate Government. *Chicago*.
- D. T. Herndon, B.S. Alabama Polytechnic Institute 1902, M.S. 1903. The Secession Movement in Georgia in 1850. *Chicago*.
- T. H. Jack, A.B. Alabama 1902, A.M. 1903; A.M. Harvard 1908. The Opposition to Secession in Alabama. *Chicago*.
- N. M. M. Surrey, B.S. Chicago 1903; A.M. Wisconsin 1909. History of Commerce and Industry in Louisiana during the French Régime. *Columbia*.

- C. B. Goodykoontz, A.B. Colorado 1912; A.M. California 1914. The Province of Louisiana under Spain. *California*.
 E. P. Puckett, A.B. Howard (Ala.) 1903; A.M. Tulane 1907. The Free Negro in Louisiana. *Harvard*.

WESTERN STATES

- P. J. Stoneberg, A.B. Knox College 1899, A.M. 1901; A.M. Columbia 1905. Early Land Speculation in the Northwest Territory. *Columbia*.
 W. E. Stevens, A.B. Knox 1913; A.M. Illinois 1914. The Fur-Trade in the Great Lakes Region after 1783. *Illinois*.
 B. H. Schockel, S.B. Chicago 1911, S.M. 1913. The Historical Geography of the Lead Region of Illinois-Wisconsin-Iowa. *Chicago*.
 H. H. Bass, Litt.B. Wisconsin 1902, Litt.M. 1903. The Woollen Industry in the Mississippi Valley prior to the Introduction of the Factory System. *Harvard*.
 Isaac Lippincott, A.B. Harvard 1902; A.M. Washington 1908; Ph.D. Chicago 1912. The History of Manufactures in the Ohio Valley to 1860. *Chicago*.
 R. S. Cotterill, A.B. Kentucky Wesleyan 1904; A.M. Virginia 1907. Organized Railroad-Booming in the Mississippi Valley, 1837-1857. *Wisconsin*.
 H. C. Hubbard, A.B. Chicago 1904. Disunion Sentiment in the Northwest, 1860-1861. *Chicago*.
 W. C. Spielman, A.B. Cincinnati 1905, A.M. 1907. The Economic Basis of Ohio Politics, 1803-1870. *Johns Hopkins*.
 C. C. Huntington, B.S. Antioch 1896; Ph.B. Ohio State 1902, A.M. 1903. A History of Banking and Currency in Ohio prior to the Civil War. *Cornell*.
 E. F. Colburn, A.B. Miami 1907; A.M. Cincinnati 1908. The Republican Party in Ohio, 1854-1865. *Chicago*.
 I. C. Hamilton, A.B. Indiana 1900; Ph.D. Chicago 1907. The History of Administration in Illinois. *Chicago*.
 J. F. Lee, A.B. Des Moines 1904; A.M. Iowa 1905; Ph.D. Chicago 1913. Transportation as a Factor in the Development of Illinois. *Chicago*.
 J. J. Kile, A.B. Rockford 1912; A.M. Illinois 1914. The German Settlement in Illinois. *Illinois*.
 C. L. Stewart, A.B. Illinois Wesleyan 1911; A.M. Illinois 1912. Farm Tenure in Illinois since 1880. *Illinois*.
 C. A. Hanford, A.B. Illinois 1912, A.M. 1913. Commission Government in the Cities of Illinois. *Illinois*.
 Clara Crawford, Ph.B. Chicago 1911, A.M. 1912. History of Legislation concerning Education in Michigan and Wisconsin. *Chicago*.
 L. G. Cooper, A.B. Michigan 1904, A.M. 1910. Political Campaigns of the Civil War in Michigan. *Michigan*.
 F. B. Streeter, A.B. Kansas 1911, A.M. 1912. History of Political Parties in Michigan, 1844-1860. *Michigan*.

- A. E. Parkins, A.M. Michigan State Normal College 1911; S.B. Chicago 1912, Ph.D. 1914. The Historical Geography of Detroit. *Chicago*.
- V. J. Farrar, A.B. Wisconsin 1911, A.M. 1912. Public Land Policy of Wisconsin. *Wisconsin*.
- Katharine J. Gallagher, A.B. Vassar 1909; A.M. Wisconsin 1913. The Missionary Career of the Right Rev. Jackson Kemper, in the Northwest, 1835-1859. *Wisconsin*.
- Fred Merk, A.B. Wisconsin 1911. Economic History of Wisconsin in the Civil War. *Wisconsin*.
- C. J. Posey, S.B. Illinois 1900; S.M. Chicago 1905. The Historical Geography of St. Paul. *Chicago*.
- C. O. Sauer, A.B. Central Wesleyan 1908. The Historical Geography of the Ozark Region of Missouri. *Chicago*.
- J. D. Hicks, A.B. Northwestern 1913, A.M. 1914. Constitutional Development in the Far Western States since the Civil War. *Wisconsin*.
- L. F. Jackson, A.B. North Dakota 1902; Ph.M. Chicago 1909. The History of Protestant Missions to the Sioux and Chippewa Indians. *Harvard*.
- Roy Gittinger, A.B. Oklahoma 1902; A.M. Chicago 1906. The Evolution of the State of Oklahoma, 1870-1906. *California*.
- J. L. Kingsbury, A.B. Dartmouth 1905. The Formation of the Colorado Territory. *Chicago*.
- L. P. Fox, A.B. Wisconsin 1911, A.M. 1912. The Populist Movement in Colorado, 1890-1896. *Pennsylvania*.
- L. E. Young, B.S. Utah 1895. The Social and Economic History of Utah under the Leadership of Brigham Young. *Columbia*.
- J. J. Hill, A.B. Brigham Young College 1909. The Economic Foundation of the Mormon Church. *California*.
- C. W. Hackett, A.B. Texas 1909; A.M. California 1914. The Revolt of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico in 1680. *California*.
- Clement Akerman, A.B. Georgia 1898. Studies in the Economic History of the Pacific Northwest. *Harvard*.
- C. E. Chapman, A.B. Tufts 1902; LL.B. Harvard 1905; A.M. California 1909. The Anza Expedition to California, 1775-1776. *California*.
- W. H. Ellison, A.B. Randolph-Macon 1904; A.M. California 1913. The Indian Policy of the United States in California, 1847-1876. *California*.
- Mary Floyd Williams, A.B. California 1913. The San Francisco Vigilance Committee, 1851-1856. *California*.
- O. C. Coy, Ph.B. Pacific 1907; A.M. Leland Stanford 1909. The Settlement and Development of the Humboldt River Region, California. *California*.

AMERICA OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

- S. M. Eastman, A.B. Toronto 1907. Canada in the Seventeenth Century. *Columbia*.
- R. D. Cahall, Ph.B. Kenyon College 1908. The Sovereign Council of New France. *Columbia*.

- J. S. Custer, A.B. William Jewell 1907; B.A. Oxford 1910. The Canadian Constitutional Act of 1791. *Wisconsin*.
- W. C. Clark, A.M. Queen's 1910. The History of the Canadian Grain Trade. *Harvard*.
- G. C. Davidson, A.B. Toronto 1906; A.M. California, 1908. The Westward Movement in Canada. *California*.
- R. R. Hill, A.B. Eureka 1900. The Office of Viceroy in Colonial Spanish America. *Columbia*.
- Vera Lee Brown, A.B. McGill 1912, A.M. 1913. The Audiencia in Colonial Spanish America. *Bryn Mawr*.
- H. I. Priestley, A.B. Southern California 1900, A.M. 1907. Joseph Galvez in New Spain. *California*.
- Mary W. Williams, A.B. Leland Stanford 1907, A.M. 1908. The Relations of England and the United States in Central America since 1815. *Leland Stanford*.
- J. B. Lockey, B.S. Peabody College 1902; A.M. Columbia 1909. Latin America and the Monroe Doctrine. *Columbia*.
- D. G. Munro, A.B. Wisconsin 1912. The Monroe Doctrine as applied to Central America. *Pennsylvania*.
- W. C. Westergaard, A.B. North Dakota 1906; M.L. California 1910. The Danish West Indies under Company and King, 1670-1770. *California*.
- Eleanor C. Buckley, A.B. Texas 1908, A.M. 1909. The Economic Forces underlying Latin-American Independence. *Pennsylvania*.
- W. T. Morrey, A.B. Ohio State 1888; A.M. New York 1893. Bolivar and the Spanish-American Revolution. *Columbia*.
- E. E. Vann, A.B. Birmingham College (Alabama) 1902; B.D. Vanderbilt 1907. The Abolition of Slavery in Brazil. *Columbia*.
- Henry Gil, Barrister Univ. of La Plata 1909; A.M. Pennsylvania 1911. The Foreign Policy of the Argentine Republic on the American Continent. *Pennsylvania*.

DISSERTATIONS PRINTED SINCE DECEMBER, 1913

- A. B. West, *The Chalcidic League*. (Madison, University of Wisconsin Bulletin, 1914.)
- C. B. Coleman, *Constantine the Great and Christianity*. (New York, Longmans, 1914.)
- Maude A. Huttman, *Persecution and Toleration in the Early Fourth Century*. (New York, Longmans, 1914.)
- N. S. B. Gras, *The Evolution of the English Corn Market, 1100-1700*. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1914.)
- S. B. Terry, *Financing the Hundred Years War, 1337-1360*. (London, London School of Economics, 1914.)
- Violet Barbour, *Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington*. (Washington, American Historical Association, in press.)
- F. A. Golder, *Russian Expansion on the Pacific, 1641-1850*. (Cleveland, The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1914.)

- E. M. North, *Some Social Consequences of the Wesleyan Revival*. (Privately printed.)
- Ahmed Emin, *The Development of Modern Turkey as measured by its Press*. (Privately printed.)
- P. C. Phillips, *The West in the Diplomacy of the American Revolution*. (University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, vol. II., nos. 2 and 3.)
- Rachel C. Eaton, *John Ross and the Cherokee Nation*. (Menasha, Wis., Geo. Banta.)
- B. B. Kendrick, *The Journal of the Joint Committee of Fifteen on Reconstruction*. (New York, Longmans, 1914.)
- Elsie M. Rushmore, *The Indian Policy during Grant's Administration*. (Privately printed.)
- D. C. Sowers, *The Financial History of New York State*. (Privately printed.)
- A. J. Hall, *Religious Education in the Public Schools of the State of New York*. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1914.)
- Margaret S. Morriss, *Colonial Trade of Maryland*. (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Studies, 1914.)
- H. M. Henry, *The Police Control of the Slave in South Carolina*. (Emory, Va., 1914.)
- J. R. McCain, *Georgia as a Proprietary Province*. (Privately printed.)
- R. P. Brooks, *History of Land Tenure in Georgia, 1865-1910*. (Madison, University of Wisconsin Bulletin, 1914.)
- Cleo Hearon, *Mississippi and the Compromise of 1850*. (University, Mississippi Historical Society, 1913.)
- H. A. Trexler, *Slavery in Missouri, 1804-1865*. (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Studies, 1914.)
- T. M. Marshall, *The History of the Western Boundary of the Louisiana Purchase, 1819-1841*. (University of California Press, 1914.)
- W. J. Trimble, *The Mining Advance into the Inland Empire*. (Madison, University of Wisconsin Bulletin, 1914.)
- Cardinal Goodwin, *The Establishment of State Government in California, 1848-1850*. (New York, Macmillan, 1914.)
- T. L. Stoddard, *The French Revolution in San Domingo*. (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1914.)